

The
Beginning of Things
In Nature and in Grace

Joseph K. Wight

5.22.16.

Library of the Theological Seminary,
PRINCETON, N. J.

Presented by Prof. John D. Davis, D.D.

Division BS1235

Section 8.W65


THE BEGINNING OF THINGS IN NATURE AND IN GRACE

OR

A BRIEF COMMENTARY ON GENESIS

BY

✓
JOSEPH K. WIGHT



BOSTON
SHERMAN, FRENCH & COMPANY

1911

Copyright, 1911
SHERMAN, FRENCH & COMPANY

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
------------------------	---

PART I

THE BEGINNING OF THINGS IN NATURE

I. CREATION	21
II. THE CREATION OF MAN	39
III. THE UNITY OF MANKIND	53
IV. THE GARDEN OF EDEN AND THE FALL	58
V. CAIN AND ABEL	69
VI. CHRONOLOGY	80
VII. THE FLOOD	90
VIII. THE ETHNOLOGICAL RECORD AND CON- FUSION OF TONGUES	105

PART II

THE BEGINNING OF THINGS IN GRACE

IX. GRACE WITH RESPECT TO THE INDIVIDUAL —THE CALLING OF ABRAHAM ON THE DIVINE SIDE	115
X. CALLING OF ABRAHAM FROM THE HUMAN SIDE	125

CONTENTS

XI.	JACOB ON THE POSITION OF PRAYER IN THE INDIVIDUAL LIFE	135
XII.	JOSEPH, OR THE EXALTATION AND TRIUMPH OF RELIGION IN THE INDIVIDUAL LIFE	147
XIII.	THE FAMILY—(1) MARRIAGE	160
XIV.	THE FAMILY—(2) THE TRAINING OF CHILDREN	169
XV.	BEGINNINGS OF GRACE IN THE NATION .	177

THE BEGINNING OF THINGS
IN NATURE AND IN GRACE

INTRODUCTION

INSPIRATION

It is evident that our interpretation of the Bible will depend very largely upon what we consider the Bible to be. If we look upon it simply as a human production among other human productions,—a system of religion among other systems,—then we shall expect mistakes, false standards, and false reasonings, as we do elsewhere. But if the Bible is exceptional—a revelation from God, and not merely the teachings of man, we shall expect to find it a transcript of his character—a pure, true, and safe guide in all that it professes to be. It is given to man as God's way of salvation from sin and death. In dealing with it, the question of authorship is our first question.

THE WORD AND WORKS OF GOD EQUALLY FROM HIM

It is much the same with the word of God as with his works. Where did the heavens and the earth come from? Did God make them? or did solid ground come from nebulous matter and that we know not whence? If so, then we may believe in a chance law evolving an orderly cosmos out of chaos, in vegetable and animal, coming as the result of spontaneous generation, and man with his wonderful faculties and possibilities the descendant of Simian ancestors. Instead, however, of

such impossibilities we are persuaded that science herself will eventually acknowledge with devout adoration the plain and only satisfactory solution that a wise and Almighty God created all things by the word of his power. He began with a clear and definite plan. He spake and the result was fitted to carry out that plan, and so is was all very good. So we think with reference to the word of God. God was its author, and not any chance design or instinct of human thought. Whence, for instance, came the institution of sacrifice? Could our first parents forecast that God could be propitiated in that way, when its full meaning did not dawn on the world until four thousand years after they were driven out of Paradise? Was it a migrating impulse that led Abraham from Ur of the Chaldees, or the call of God to a life of faith in the unseen, which resulted in his being not only the founder of the Jewish nation, but an example to the whole Gentile world! Did Moses and David build Tabernacle and Temple according to human ideas, or after a pattern shown in the Mount, which indicated God's dwelling with men and the way of approach to him? Did Isaiah speak of himself or some other man, when he spake of the servant of the Lord who was a Prince and a Saviour and who was to be exalted among the nations, as also a Lamb led to the slaughter? Did Daniel speak of earthly kingdoms when he told Nebuchadnezzar of a stone cut out of the mountains without hands, filling the whole earth

and enduring forever? Was the Lord Jesus a mere man, though proved to be the Son of God by his resurrection and by transforming sinful men into saints and heirs of eternal life?

But it may be said these questions refer to the great scheme of salvation through Christ. That is true. But that scheme and the inspired word stand or fall together. The inspired word is a part of God's revelation of the way of salvation, and how it is linked in and forms a part of the whole scheme of revelation we propose briefly to discuss.

REVELATION A MATTER OF GRACE

Our first remark is that a revelation at all, beyond that made in his works, is a matter of free grace. God might have said and virtually did say for the first two thousand years of man's dwelling on the earth and to the thousands of heathen since, my works in Creation and Providence show the wisdom, power and goodness of an Almighty Creator. That the heathen are without excuse for their idolatry is the position taken by the apostle in the first chapter of the Epistle to the Romans and in his speech at Athens. And then there was left in our spiritual nature not only a disposition to worship God, but to seek reconciliation when we have sinned, by repentance, as the Ninevites did at the preaching of Jonah. This was still further strengthened and directed by giving to our first parents the institution of sacrifice. Fol-

lowing these guides of what we may call natural religion, there were not a few who followed him before the Flood—as the sons of God and especially Enoch and Noah, who are described as walking with God. And after the Flood were such individuals as Melchisedec, and Job, and Balaam, whose knowledge was correct but wrong in his practice. The vast majority, however, sought not after God. And so God began to put in execution a new scheme of revelation by sending his Son to seek and to save the lost.

FOUR DIFFERENT METHODS OF REVELATION

The Revelation which began with the call of Abraham has been carried out in four different ways. First, there was the direct and special message to the individual. A second method was by a spoken, and afterwards a written message through Prophets. A third was by Christ, the Son of God. And the fourth by the Holy Spirit in the hearts of believers. These different methods aid and supplement one another. Thus the written word helps us to understand the mission of Christ—especially his work as our great High Priest. But my special thought in connection with the subject of inspiration is the help they give to the truthfulness and reliability of the record. The written word has come to us through fallible men. Can we have an infallible record through a fallible source? Some would say, No. And we should all say No, except for divine as-

sistance. Did the writers of the Bible have this assistance in sufficient measure to keep them from error in fact and in doctrine? We maintain that they did. Others allege that while correct theologically, they shared with others of their age in scientific mistakes, and have therefore given us myths and fables, which we are to correct from our more enlightened standpoint. It might be asserted also that good men, influenced, as we believe, by the Holy Spirit, are constantly making mistakes, not only in their conduct but in their writings. Thus it is said an Apocryphal writer asserts that the world can be divided into seven parts, of which two-sevenths are seas and oceans while the rest is solid land. More accurate knowledge would have shown that two-thirds or three-fourths are water. So one Clement, who lived not long after the Apostles and wrote as Paul did a letter to the Corinthian church, in the midst of much good counsel, repeats as true the fable of the phoenix, which was said to exist singly for five hundred years and to rise from its own ashes. Was this weakness, which has been the lot of good men, though influenced by the Spirit, shared by the sacred writers? Have they made mistakes in facts? I think not, as I have attempted to show in the following volume with respect to the book of Genesis.

Two things have been attempted: First, to show that no good reason has been offered for doubting the facts as stated; second, that any sugges-

tion of alteration only increases the difficulties of interpretation. Notably is this true with respect to two leading facts of the first part of Genesis—the Creation of man and the Fall. If these are denied or in any way misrepresented, we come in conflict with our inheritance through the first Adam and our restoration through the second. The Bible is a unit from Genesis to Revelation. But the point which I wish now to urge is, that the other parts of revelation lead us to expect absolute truth in the record.

TRUTH TO BE EXPECTED WHEN GOD SPEAKS
DIRECTLY TO MEN

I have already alluded to the fact that the word and works of God are from the same author. In the 19th Psalm this thought is enlarged upon; and one of the specifications is that the law of the Lord is perfect. The part then written which we are prone to say is imperfect, is compared to the works of God in the heavens as perfect. We get our idea of perfection from the works of nature. Exactness is the law in the biology of the universe. Like produces its like now, as in the dawn of creation. The variation of the millionth part of a second is not allowed in the clock whose wheels are the stars. To this perfection Job is brought back as he suffers from boils, and is confronted with the injustice of friends and the seeming inequalities of Providence. The Almighty points to the work of his hands in the animal creation and Job

repents of his hard thoughts about God and recognizes the fact that in his moral government, with all the entanglements of sin and Satan, there are no mistakes, any more than in the physical. When such a God speaks to his servants as he did to Abraham there is no doubt about the truthfulness of the command, or the duty of obedience. Even when the command seemed to run counter to the promise—especially when it said, “Take thy son Isaac and offer him up on the mountain which I will show thee,” he did not argue with God about the unreasonableness and mistake of thus putting away the child of promise, but goes directly to work to carry out the injunction. It was God who commanded, and therefore it was right. He would make it plain. The Lord would provide, and so he did.

TRUTH TO BE EXPECTED WHEN GOD SPEAKS
THROUGH HIS SON

Again God spake through his Son. Is there any doubt about the truthfulness of him who dwelt in the bosom of the Father; and as the representative of his character and perfections one so like God never before appeared among the sons of men. He represented the law more clearly than Sinai. The morality of Pharisees stood aghast at his unveiling of sin. He changed men's ideas of virtue and greatness; laid down new motives for obedience, and instituted a code of ethics never equalled. And yet he was as simple and sin-

cere as a child. He made no display of power or learning. He was a King among men and yet he had no palace, throne or army. He wielded no sword. His only weapons were truth and love. He went forth as a Conqueror and yet suffered apparent defeat. His was a kingdom which took hold on the spiritual and eternal. He lifted men up into the presence of God and yet he looked upon them with such compassion and tenderness that mothers brought their babes to be blessed. He showed his power over the natural world by stilling winds and waves and healing all manner of disease. He attested that he was the Son of God by rising from the grave on the third day and thus proclaiming that death was abolished, and through him was life eternal. Moreover he begins the spiritual life while we are in the flesh and we have the evidence now in our hearts that he is "the way, the truth and the life."

TRUTH TO BE EXPECTED WHEN GOD SPEAKS
THROUGH HIS SPIRIT

A single idea will be sufficient in speaking of the truthfulness of revelation through the Spirit. How clearly the weakness and corruption of man is described, and over against it, the way of faith, the workings of different graces, the need of prayer and of constant and growing cleansing through the Spirit's own divine agency. This is really revealed in two ways (1) in the written word and (2) in the consciousness of believers

the world over and in all ages. There is no gain-saying of this record and no Christian would think of denying it. Notice how full this revelation is. It goes back to Abraham, is wonderfully developed in the Psalms which speak the experience of human nature in all its varied moods—is especially the theme of the Epistles, and has been flowing down in the hymnology and Christian literature of all ages. Some would write inspired on the choicest of these productions and very properly so, as they are the breathings of the Holy Spirit in the heart of man. Caution is, however, to be observed (1) that these utterances agree with the written word (2) that there be no attempt or pretext to give any new revelation, and consequently (3) that there be no claim to be on a parity with the sacred writers who were inspired to give to man an infallible written word.

Let us proceed to show how truth is guaranteed to man in the written word. Before stating these reasons in detail there are one or two minor points that need to be mentioned.

1. Chronology is sometimes argued about as if dates in the margin were part of the text. At the best they are only the calculations of uninspired men who have sought to reach approximately the truth. These dates vary and no one can be absolutely positive within hundreds of years.

2. Authorship where not stated is solely a matter of inference.

3. Some hold that inspiration must be verbal in order to be correct. This is, of course, true in direct messages and in such passages as those containing instructions about building the Tabernacle. But God's usual method of employing men to be co-workers with him, is to take them with all the faculties, original and acquired, with which they are endowed. Thus Moses, learned in the wisdom of the Egyptians, did not pretend to intrude his ideas into the specific instructions about priests and sacrifices, but he did dare to argue with God about the destruction of his people, and was accepted in the one case as much as the other. So God used the poetic genius and tastes of David, the clear reasoning of Paul, the practical sense of James, the statesmanship of Daniel, and even the disobedience and petulance of Jonah to carry his spiritual messages to men.

TRUTH GUARANTEED THROUGH WRITERS MOVED BY
THE HOLY SPIRIT

How has he guaranteed their truthfulness? The only adequate and all-sufficient answer is that holy men spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost. In a certain sense this is mysterious. So is the operation of the same agency in regenerating and sanctifying our lives. Only in this case the work extends further, in keeping their writings from error. Let us specify the particulars which make us believe this.

1. The intimate connection with other portions

of Scripture, which we consider infallible. When God spake directly to man or when he spake through his Son or through the Holy Spirit there was only one course left open, and that was to assent to the truth of the message. No small part of the Bible is taken up with what they said and did. Those who recorded these things had no motive to vary from the exact truth. The Jews would have been better pleased if they had conformed to their views. And the Gentiles would not have persecuted if they had suppressed their testimony. But they could not but speak the things they had seen and heard. And they had a special promise from Christ himself that when he went to the Father he would send the Spirit of truth, who should guide them into all truth (John 16:13). Partaking therefore of his life and seeking to exemplify it in the world, they claimed the right to speak with authority as having received the promise.

2. Another guaranty of the truth, was the spirit of prophecy or foretelling the future. If there is anything in which man is weak, it is in saying what shall happen even on the morrow. But here were men who announced the time and place of Christ's birth, the character of his life, the details of his suffering, death and resurrection. And while we have the humiliation and suffering, we have also the exaltation and glory—two things so incompatible in the same person, that the Jew is accepting the latter and looking for

temporal glory and that he should deliver Israel, did not accept Christ as the Messiah. These forecastings of the future also were not only a written message but inwrought into their very history in type and sacrifices and service of the tabernacle, and in the lives and characters of individual after individual during the centuries of preparation. As has been said, the greatest miracle of Christianity is Christ himself, not only in his life and teachings, but in his death and resurrection, turning the tide of human experience from death to life. So the greatest miracle of human writings is the Scriptures foretelling often what the writers themselves did not understand, the sufferings of Christ and the glory that should follow.

3. I add another guaranty and that is the unity and harmony of the writings themselves. I might begin by saying that there is unity and harmony with the fundamental principles of morality as recognized and approved by the Christian conscience the world over. Take, for example, purity of morals in a world of sensuality and corruption, there is not a line of Scripture that panders to, much less justifies vice in any form. In the midst of polygamy there is no justification of its practice. In the midst of wars and hatred its testimony is for love and peace. And so in the midst of falsehood and deceit, the sacredness and obligation of truth is preserved inviolate. We no more expect myth, fable or historical in-

accuracy than we would a justification of impurity or sensuality. But it is said all literature has its myths and fables—we say except Biblical. And if tentatively it be allowed, it only increases the difficulty of interpretation and explanation.

But let us keep more strictly to the unity and harmony of the writings themselves. Considering the fact that the Bible includes forty different human authors and extends over a period of sixteen hundred years this is most marvellous. It is not uncommon for an individual writer to disagree with himself. But here is the great wonder that writers not living at the same time or place, all harmonize in the great scheme of man's salvation. It is part fitting into part from the Fall to Calvary and from Calvary to the redeemed around the throne praising the Lamb that was slain.

Perhaps the most specious objection to this unity is the one urged that the conquest of Canaan and the slaying of thousands is contrary to the love and kindness of the New Testament. Here is an appearance of discord in history and doctrine, and which in the Old Testament seems to be emphasized in the imprecatory Psalms. But this is easily understood when we look at the typical nature of much of the Old Testament history. In the establishment of a kingdom, the first thing is subjection—the complete overthrow of all enemies. This was typified by Joshua and David. Christ in the establishment of his kingdom de-

mands entire subjection on the part of individuals and also of the nations of the earth. The method by which it was to be brought about did not appear in the Old Testament except as imperfectly typified by the peaceful reign of Solomon. But Christ is the true Joshua—the conqueror by truth and love. And the work is going on until that kingdom which is righteousness and peace comes on earth as in Heaven. So the thought is one—salvation through an atoning Saviour, submission to him as King, and by the power of a motive which is eminently not of earth but from Heaven. How wondrous the love and patience that has been teaching to man these lessons of the ages.

I might have stopped here, but am inclined to add a word from my own experience. This might be duplicated by the experience of the vast majority of workers among non-Christian peoples. I went to China in 1848, not long after the beginning of missionary effort in the five treaty ports. These facts soon appeared: (1) The darkness and superstition wrought by idolatry about fundamental spiritual truths. Take for example the idea of one God as the Creator of all things. Not only was this beyond the conception of the common people, but philosophers and wise men were in the same darkness. Confucius, an eminently wise and practical man, simply ignored what he could not understand. He centred all duties, both to government and to one another, in

the family—making our ancestors the object of reverence and worship. But the cravings of man to know about his own origin and of all things about him could not thus be set aside. So one of the common beliefs is that of the giant Pwanku, who is represented with mallet and chisel chipping out the universe from the solid rock. Buddhism that came in to supplement Confucianism about worship of gods (though Buddha himself was a man) and of the existence of the soul after death, accounted for Creation by the succession of egg from the bird and the bird from the egg and so on indefinitely—ending not in a Creator but in ignorance. (2) It was a matter of devout thankfulness that in the midst of such darkness and ignorance one could speak with perfect confidence of a Creator, of man's origin and fall and the need of a Saviour. It was a matter of surprise that the simple statement of the truth found so ready a response in the human mind. Assent was given by the intellect, even though the heart and old habits resisted. With the hope that I could help in spreading the light I went to work with the aid of my Chinese teacher, to translate Genesis into the local dialect and also prepare a compendium of Biblical history and doctrine.

(3). This work was interrupted by being obliged, through the advice of a physician, to return to this country in 1857. The thoughts and plans, however, had so far taken root that I pursued the studies here so far as I had leisure from

other duties. I am glad that the thankfulness for revealed light has continued through these subsequent years. The inclination has been not to look for the mistakes of Moses, but for the eternal verities revealed through Moses. Not that I would depreciate in any way humble and reverent criticism. By all means let men use all their learning and knowledge in seeking for truth. We honor those who do it, however much they differ from us. But much depends on our point of view. It is one thing to look upon the Flood as an overflow of the Valley of the Euphrates and hunt up Babylonian legends to support that theory, and quite another to consider it universal and sent by Jehovah to punish mankind for sin, and yet hold out the way of escape by an ark of salvation. And then I must confess that indignation sometimes waxed hot when some critics—not all—would pervert the simple and graphic narrative about individuals and make the patriarchs a story about tribes or nations. Why, we can almost see them with their tents and flocks, or sitting under the oaks of Mamre. We stand by their altars when Jehovah was worshipped in the midst of surrounding idolatry. And their faults are recorded as clearly as their virtues. And then what a picture of the relation of the individual soul to God. See the faith of Abraham, the type of all believers the training of Jacob and transforming him from a supplanter to Israel, a prince of God, and then how this personal relation culminates in Joseph with his mas-

tery over temptation and in love instead of wrongs against his brethren, and in his exaltation over the world as represented in his being ruler over Egypt. It will not seem strange, therefore, if some of us are obliged to say, not proven, to not a few of the claims of the critics, notwithstanding their acknowledged learning and scholarship. I sometimes think they are using the wrong end of the glass in looking microscopically at objects and divergencies, instead of taking in as with a telescope the magnitude and unity of God's plans. They say of their conclusions that they are proved beyond a doubt. But I imagine the controversy will not be over until the Bible comes forth clear and resplendent with no apology for myth or fable, with no change of history as in Deuteronomy from the close of desert wanderings to post-exilic times. We believe its truth in all statement of facts will shine out just as positively as its purity and complete adaption to the wants and capacities of man. When Christ was crucified, his friends came with linen and spices to prepare him for his burial. They were loyal in their grief. They sought to make all amends possible for what his enemies had done. But their work was unnecessary, for he was not dead, but risen. So the written word has about it a living vitality which cannot be buried any more than a living Christ. We apologize and bring our explanations. But are they in accord with the living word? If not,

they will lie in the grave and be forgotten. May the time be hastened when we shall all rejoice in the living word, man's safe and only guide from earth to heaven.

J. K. W.

PART I

THE BEGINNING OF THINGS
IN NATURE

THE FIRST ELEVEN CHAPTERS
OF GENESIS

CHAPTER I

CREATION

1. The main thought of the Bible is God's revelation of salvation for man. But who is the Revealer? and who is the Saviour? No answer is so appropriate and satisfactory as this, that he who provided the salvation is the Creator—our Creator, and the Creator of all things.

THE ULTIMATE AGREEMENT OF SCIENCE AND REVELATION

As the main thought of the Bible is acknowledged by all to be theological or religious, it is held by some (as, for example, Canon Driver in his "Commentary on Genesis") that its statements may be true *theologically* but not *scientifically*. Driver quotes with approval the remark of Abbe Loisy that "the science of the Bible is the science of the age in which it was written. And to expect to find in it, supernatural information on points of scientific fact is to mistake its entire purpose." (p. 33). This seems plausible. But take the first verse of Genesis, "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth," and it would be difficult to say whether it is a scientific or a theological fact. The few details of the creative process in the first chapter might be called scientific statements, which some would dispute, but when we come to the record, "God created

man in his own image," shall we call that a scientific or a theological statement? Canon Driver and others would put it in the realm of antiquated science, but a fuller and fairer investigation may show that it is true both scientifically and theologically. If Revelation is from God, the direct inference is that what he says accords with his character in being absolutely true. The words and works of God are both from him, and need no reconciliation, except in our interpretation. In the interpretation great mistakes have been made, but we can rest assured of an abiding agreement in the last analysis; because God is the Creator and Author of all that we are trying to reach by both science and revelation. The following pages have been written with the hope of finding such an agreement possible; and the result has been an increasing conviction that whenever science has attempted to find fault with revelation, the only satisfactory solution is to come back to the words of the Book.

CREATION OUT OF NOTHING

2. *In the beginning*, says the record. When that was, no one can say. Science has helped us to say very positively that it was more than six thousand years ago. The great fact is not *when*, but that *God* created the heavens and the earth. There are two possible ways of accounting for the existence of matter (1) that it is eternal; (2) that it was made out of nothing. An attempt by Sir Wm.

Hamilton, Wilford Hall, and others, to think of a third way, viz., that matter was condensed or evolved out of the being of God, is unsatisfactory. Its leaning is towards Pantheism, or that God is the soul of the universe. God *created*, not simply fashioned, but created the original material. Matter in its original simplest form is supposed to have been nebulous. Unresolved nebulae are found in various parts of the heavens. And in our own solar system, Jupiter, though thirteen hundred times larger than the earth, has a specific gravity less than water. From this and other indications, it has not yet attained to an organization as complete as our earth. Guyot is inclined to maintain that in the expression, "the earth (Heb. *ere-to*) was without form and void," there is a reference to matter in general, and that waters (Heb. *ruaim*) refers to a gaseous or fluid state of the universe ("Creation," by Guyot, chap. 6).

THE SPIRIT THE AUTHOR OF LIFE

3. Over this chaotic state the Spirit of God moved or hovered. Genesis gives the word, which occurs only here and in Deut. 32: 11, the force of brooding over, as the eagle over its young, and thus imparting life. This thought which is foreign to any merely human cosmogony, is especially important as the record of an underlying truth, that the Spirit is the author of all life. We know that the highest life, that which links us to God, is from above, or the work of the Spirit. So here in the

great work of creation, before chaos is awakened into order and life, the Spirit of God is represented as brooding over unorganized matter. As matter could not make itself, so its subsequent forms of order, life and beauty are of divine origin. This truth has two significant bearings—First as to the record itself. It confirms the thought of inspiration. It is an advance statement of what human wisdom would not have ventured to state so early in the record. And second, science, as long as it confines its investigations to the material and does not allow for the workings of the spiritual above and over it, imposes a limitation upon itself—a limitation which makes it fall short of the truth. In the revealed cosmogony mind and matter are indissolubly connected—God the Creator and the thing created; and we fear the scientific will never be right unless the theological is admitted to its right position also.

LIGHT

4. We come now to the actual work of creation during the six days or periods of time. The first thing created was light by the simple fiat of the Almighty. This was physical light, for in one sense God was always light. "In him is no darkness at all" (1 John 1:5). Physical light is connected with motion and heat. There is no localizing either in this creation of light. Heat there was in abundance on our earth, and a luminous atmosphere seems to have continued for ages, not

needing, and perhaps not having, the light of the sun until the fourth day or period. This creation of light preceded and would be helpful to life whenever it should appear. Heat, the usual accompaniment of light, does not cause life, but promotes and stimulates it after it once exists. The living plant responds to light and heat from the sun, but the sun has no such effect on dead wood or inorganic matter. Prof. Haeckel maintains that in its first or lowest forms, life comes through spontaneous generation. But Pasteur and others have shown that even in fermentation, a living germ is a necessity. By chemical analysis and microscopic observation, we may get very near to life, but we never touch it, much less can the most consummate skill make a living worm.

DAYS LONG PERIODS OF TIME

The first time period was marked by the creation of light. It had been night,—darkness, physical darkness, in our solar system at least, until this entrance of light which was the first morning, and it was called Day. These days had no measure, according to our standard of twenty-four hours each, until the fourth period. This St. Augustine long ago recognized, and called them *Dies ineffabiles*, peculiar days. This use of the term day, for periods of time longer than twenty-four hours, is so generally acknowledged that there is no need of spending time in discussing it.

Translators of the Bible into heathen languages after spending time in choosing the best words, often find them inadequate, and are obliged to lift them from their surroundings and give them a new and higher meaning. Days and firmament are examples of what might be called a two-fold use. Days are used in a limited and also in an enlarged sense, and the other (firmament) clinging, it may be, to antiquated science, and yet ready for the new meaning when it breaks upon the understanding of men.

ATMOSPHERE

5. The next creative process was the making of the atmosphere or *expanse*; which our translators, following the Septeragint and the Vulgate, translated firmament. This translation (approved by Driver) has given currency to the idea that the Bible supported the theory that the heavens, in which the stars were placed, was a solid sphere. If so it was manifest that at least the lower part of this firmament was transparent and the upper might be and could be left to further investigation to modify. But the American translators give expanse as the equivalent for the Hebrew word. And this suits the office which the atmosphere was called upon to discharge of separating or bearing up the waters in the clouds from the waters beneath. It has been estimated that prior to this, an enveloping vapor extended some two thousand miles or more above what we now call oceans, and

that the oceans themselves were throwing up hot spray or steam from the uncooled globe. ("Miracle of To-day," p. 64).

It is not necessary to dwell upon the important uses which the atmosphere serves in bearing up and distributing moisture over the globe, nor its relation to animal and vegetable life. Neither is it necessary to discuss whether it was first made pure, or was for a time filled with gases, such as carbonic acid, which would have been helpful to the plants of the carboniferous period. Air, like light, has its thousandfold uses, which the sacred narrative does not pause to mention.

6. The third day brings us into contact with *vegetable life*. But before its appearance, and in order to bring the world into shape for a habitation for man, there was the gathering of the waters into seas, and the appearance of dry land. With the knowledge which we have gained from the up-turned edges of soil and rock, this has been a slow process. From the seething caldron of vapor and steam, the igneous rocks were slowly cooled, and lifted up into mountain ranges. And then these have been washed down and deposited in sedimentary rocks. Again and again have continents and islands been lifted up, and as often submerged. Rivers have found channels and worn them into deep cañons by waters more abundant than now flow between their banks. Successive forms of vegetable and animal life have clothed and peopled the surface, leaving no vestige except in their tombs, of their former existence.

Volcanos have lifted mountains, poured down torrents of lava. Coral insects have built up islands. And as we look at these manifold changes, we wonder how long this process has been going on. Sir Wm. Thompson estimates that the time required from incipient incrustation to its present state does not exceed eighty million years. But without going back so far it has been estimated that the time from the formation of the sedimentary rocks has been thirty million years. This estimate is based upon the rate of erosion in such a river as the Mississippi (see *Le Conte Geology*, p. 264). These long periods of time, even if we reduce them thirty or eighty millions of years to ten or through millenniums, teach us this lesson that if God was so long fitting up a world for sinful man—the corresponding fact of a purified world and an eternity in the future for redeemed man, should not seem strange.

VEGETABLE LIFE

After the appearance of dry land, the next step was the introduction of vegetable life. The two points stated are (1) that God did it, and (2) that this life had the power of reproducing itself. Inorganic matter tends to disintegration and decay. Its highest and most permanent form is the crystal. But neither in that form, nor in any other, has it any tendency to pass into the life of either vegetable or animal. Spontaneous generation is not the method, but the seed, having life in

itself and like producing its like through succeeding generations. One apparent difficulty is a day for vegetable life and then after that a day for animal life, whereas they were largely intermingled for long periods of time. But all that seems intended is to specify the introduction of each form. The changes incident to each, follow in long succession. It was thus with light and air. Light at first was not localized even in our solar system. And the air or atmosphere about our earth, underwent great changes in purity and temperature before man appeared. So far as known, one of the lowest or most simple forms of vegetable life is *graphite*, a cryptogamous fern which appears among the coal plants of St. John, N. B. (Dana's *Geology*, p. 157). We have a right to assume that all the possibilities and variety of vegetable life down to the fruits and grapes of our own time, were in the mind of the Almighty when he called upon the earth to bring forth "herbs yielding seed and fruit trees bearing fruit after their kind." And yet it would seem as though there was a special thought with regard to the carboniferous plants, from which we obtain our supply of coal. The abundance and richness of this form of vegetable life may be judged, when it is estimated that forests like those of the valley of the Amazon would produce only half an inch of coal, while there are coal beds varying from four to twenty feet in thickness. These plants were allied to ferns and ground pines. And of them some five hundred

varieties are enumerated, many of them of great size—all fresh water plants, but not like plants now in existence.

Another notable fact about coal-beds is that they are found in the Arctic regions. This is true also of later forests. Magnolias, Hickories, Southern Cypress and Sequoias now peculiar to California, once grew in Greenland. The same also may be said of animal life. The elephant was at one time a native of Great Britain, and his remains with those of other animals belonging to the tropics, have been found in the frozen regions of Siberia.

For a long time—perhaps until the fourth day or period, the atmosphere about our earth seems to have been self-luminous and more heated than now, with a greater degree of moisture, and more or less filled with carbonic acid and other gases favorable to vegetation and to some types of animal life.

7. In the fourth day or period, nothing is said about any act of creation, but only the appointment or designation of sun and moon to fulfill certain purposes. Of their existence before this, nothing is said, nor of the time when he made the stars. The cooling of the earth and the dissipation of gases in the atmosphere was doubtless a slow process, even after the sun began to appear. This state of the atmosphere accounts for coal and forest trees of southern climes in the north more satisfactorily than the change in polar direction, which it is sometimes thought took place on

the fourth day. While light and heat resident in the atmosphere were favorable for the extraordinary growth of the carboniferous period, yet continuous light and heat would not be the most suitable for man. He needs the alternation of day and night, the change of seasons and of climate. To secure these ends the sun and moon were appointed as luminaries. At the same time there was such a clearing of the atmosphere that the stars were visible also.

OUR RELATION TO OTHER WORLDS

In following out the history of creation on this world of ours, it is not necessary to refer to other worlds, yet as we are a part of the universe which God has made, there are some thoughts which thrust themselves into notice as we read the brief statement, "He made the stars also."

The first is the enlarged conception which we get of God as the Creator of the heavens, as well as of the earth. We are part of a whole, which seems almost infinite in variety and extent. When David looked at the heavens he wondered at the condescension of God to man. And yet he only saw some five or six thousand stars, while the telescope brings to view from forty to fifty millions. And some authorities say over one hundred millions. And yet their great number is eclipsed as we learn something of their magnitude, velocity and immense distances from us and from one another. Certainly no being is so great as he who

made and controls them. Omnipotence and omnipresence gain new significance as we think of him who "bringeth out their host by number and calleth them by their names."*

Another thought is that God has the highest regard for those attributes of character which have to do with moral qualities, rather than greatness or might. Intellectual insight which foresees and provides for wants, thousands of years before needed, and marvellous power such as seen in the creation and government of worlds, are not to be compared with the love and mercy exhibited in the salvation of men. This view of the divine character is to be taken into account, when the question arises, why did God choose so inconspicuous a world as ours—a world not visible to other systems—for the display of a plan of salvation vastly more significant and important than any other act that has transpired in all the universe? That the Son of God should die for the restoration of any of his creatures on any part of the universe makes that spot, however insignificant otherwise, the moral center. Whether it be the physical center is an entirely different question. Alfred Wallace has sought to establish the fact "that our sun is one of the central orbs of a globular star cluster

* "In the Harvard Observatory on the Andes erected for the purpose of photographing the stars, it is said that a single negative 17 by 14 inches caught the picture of 400,000 stars and that it would take two thousand plates to cover the entire heavens." Dr. F. E. Clark's "Continent of Opportunity," p. 112.

and that this star cluster occupies a nearly central position in the great plane of the milky way." (From an article in the "Independent," and afterwards published in a book.) Other scientists claim that we cannot define the bounds of the universe, that there is no proof that we are in the center and that we are drifting through space at the rate of a million miles a day. Into this discussion we need not enter, except to say that we assume that God alone is infinite, and that the universe, however boundless, is finite. Why God has so exalted this earth above other worlds in creating man in his own image and then when he had fallen, of redeeming him through his only Son, may remain a mystery until we have left the body and have become more familiar with the marvelous works of God.

8. *Animal life*, or the work of the fifth and sixth days. The first thought is the vast variety of animal life. The waters swarmed with swarms* of living creatures. The air was peopled with birds, and on the land were living creatures from the animalculæ invisible except by microscope to the immense reptiles of the carboniferous period and the great beasts of a later age. The perfection of these organisms in all their minute details

* The wonderfully prolific period of shell fish or part of these "swarms" is seen in the fact that out of the 60,000 to 70,000 feet of rock on the earth's surface 15,000 to 20,000 feet was added by these minute creatures. Ehrenberg estimates that a cubic inch of chalk contains more than a million of the shells of Rhizopods. (Dana's Geology, p. 471.)

is no less wonderful than the magnitudes and velocities of the heavenly bodies.

2. There were certain laws imposed on animal life at the beginning which are more or less disputed in scientific circles. (1) Life is from God. (2) There is a marked distinction between animal and vegetable life, even in their lower forms. The worm, though it grows in the ground, is not a root. A grub, though it looks like the leaf on which it is feeding, or the bark to which it clings, is different from either. (3) That the law of succession and transmission is that like produces its like both in the animal and vegetable kingdoms. (4) Aside from the skill and purpose evidenced in the individual animal in fashioning all the parts for the end for which it was made, there is a plan and purpose in the whole cosmos, attested by the words concluding each act of creation, "God saw that it was good." It was good and suitable for the great end which he had in view. That there was a plan is evident from such facts as the laying up of coal and metals long before they were needed, and from the wise adjustment of the different parts to one great whole, as the atmosphere to the lungs of the animals breathing it, and the amount of water to the growth and perfection of plants depending upon it. And then there is the direct relation of all these different parts to man as the supreme head and ruler here on the earth. With reference to the law of like producing its like, there is and has been from its promulgation

six thousand years ago, ample evidence that it is the uniform law of nature. A modification of this law, which admits of variation and improvement within certain limits, has been exalted into a law and is the basis of the theory of *Evolution*.

EVOLUTION

It seems necessary briefly to discuss this theory, as it has an important bearing upon modern interpretations of Scripture. The word is sometimes used in a very vague sense. Thus Dr. Lyman Abbott in his "Problems of Life," (p. 191) says, "This is what Evolution means—ordered progress, development from poorer to richer, from lower to higher, from less to greater—progress." In this sense all theists are Evolutionists. It requires but little examination of God's methods both in nature and in grace to see that he advances in the line of progress. The question is whether the progress is a part of his impress on the material, or whether it inheres in matter. True Evolutionists adopt the latter view. Thus Le Conte says, "Evolution is (1) continuous, progressive change, (2) according to certain laws, and (3) by means of resident forces." ("Evolution," p. 8). Or more fully Mr. Joel A. Allen in his Preface to "The New Natural History" says, "All living creatures, including the *physical* part of man himself, may be and probably are, the lineal descendants of a single ancestral stock common to them all; and all the differences between

the different sorts of animals are due entirely to the familiar forces of nature which have operated over an enormous lapse of time and are still operating today in exactly the same way that they have operated in the past." Prof. Tyndall would say that the molecular forces determine the form which the solar energy shall assume—resulting in the one case in the formation of a cabbage, in another in the formation of an oak. The switching of the machinery which is governed by no law or purpose results, it may be, in a grasshopper or in the formation of a man.

It is neither kind nor fair to charge a theory with tendencies which its advocates deny. Le Conte, for instance, strongly maintains the immanence of God in all things—"through him all things exist and without him there would be and could be nothing" ("Evolution," p. 300). And yet he clothes matter with an inherent force which makes it capable of originating a new form of life. It may take thousands of years to do it and yet it does it all the same. How this differs from Prof. Haeckel's frank avowal of spontaneous generation it is difficult to say. But if materialism is not accepted in its full form, there is the claim that inherent force is the determining cause in each successive generation. Says Le Conte, "*Organic forms* follow one another in a continuous chain, each derived from a preceding, and giving origin to a succeeding. This is a law of derivation, and we might call it a law of causation"

("Evolution," p. 65). This might result in any haphazard development, as a cabbage or a man, or it might be claimed that the modification might go on improving on self-constituted lines. That is, if the final result of the thought of matter (if such a thing is conceivable) was man, then when bulk was in evidence as in the Reptilian period, we might have had a man of huge proportions—a great Saurian with snake-like head and a body as big as a trolley car, but certainly not very elegant in appearance. Or when at the time of the great beasts of the pre-glacial period, a tangent flying off towards man would have given us something like the cave lions, bear or hyenas with their carnivorous dispositions. But since, according to evolution, man has developed from the ape, and he is what he is, may we not properly expect a still higher and more beautiful animal evolved from the birds? Some scientist has very properly suggested this as a future possibility—certainly a possibility if it is to be decided by material forms.

The difficulty then with the hypothesis of Evolution is, (1) its tendency towards materialism. (2) When this is denied, it gives to matter the attributes of divinity—if the inherent force can look forward to a grand plan such as has been developed in the past from Chaos to Cosmos. (3) It disturbs the uniformity of nature, which is that like produces its like. (4) It takes a modification of that law, which gives room for variation and improvement and makes it the central law. And

yet discarding as we must the theory of Evolution as stated by its advocates, there are certain truths which the discussion has called out that are to be recognized as: (1) God has clothed organic forms with the power of reproduction. It is not a new creation, every time a seed produces its like, or an egg the offspring of the parent; but a wonderful potency of perpetuating life and the peculiarities of one generation down to the next. (2) With the like producing its like, the variation is also perpetuated. In this way improvements are made on the original stock in animal and vegetable, and especially in this way are the advances in civilization perpetuated. This may well be termed progressive development. It is this which has given to the theory of evolution its force and currency in the popular mind. It is what many mean when they say God works through evolution. If by that is meant a force inherent in matter, then we deny. But if the directing thought is God's and not matter, then we affirm. But we must take exception to language that is misleading. It is a contradiction to say God directs, when matter by inherent force directs itself. The organic forms of matter have a relation to God very similar to that occupied by angelic beings. They do his bidding.

CHAPTER II

THE CREATION OF MAN

Before taking up the main topic of this chapter there are two preliminary subjects which it is necessary briefly to consider. One is that of God's Sabbath, and second, the documentary theory.

GOD'S SABBATH

1. After the brief account in the first chapter of the creation of man (1:26-31), it is said, (II. v. 2), "and on the seventh day God finished his work which he had made . . . and God blessed the seventh day and hallowed it; because that in it he rested from all his work which God had created and made." The question arises, was this seventh day like the preceding six? if so, it would cover a long period of time. In favor of this is the lack of the formula, "the evening and the morning were the seventh day." It is at least open to us, who are living, as we think, in this seventh day, to speak of it as the day of redemption. After the creation of man God ceased creative work. He had reached the highest point on this earth, and the point towards which all preceding steps led. And now he looks at man in a new and higher aspect. This is God's Sabbath—the day which he is hallowing until the work of redemption is complete. We would speak of the Old Dispensation

as the evening, and the New, with Christ's coming, as the morning. And if so, we anticipate the change from the seventh as rest after six days' labor to the first of the week, and hallowing work by making redemption the first and greatest of all works. This makes God's Sabbath of the ages grandly typical of the weekly human Sabbath which he instituted at the beginning long before its promulgation on Sinai. That the human writer should have understood the significance of what he was putting down is not to be expected. It is one of those indications like the Spirit of God brooding upon the waters that indicates divine as well as human authorship. The Bible, with its many authors, is a unit—a unit because practically it has only one author. Like the works of God they are composed of individuals, but they make one great whole. The unity of this book and its divine authorship will appear more plainly as we go on.

THE DOCUMENTARY THEORY

2. Man having been thus created and placed in his high position, it was but natural that the writer, having gone over the works of creation, should recapitulate and enlarge upon this part of his work, and hence as we look upon it, are given the details in the second chapter, fourth verse and following. The introduction of the term Jehovah (Lord God, auth. ver.) has puzzled many commentators and led to the theory of different docu-

ments in the composition of Genesis. In the first chapter the term God alone is used, while in chapter 2, Jehovah God is the term. The reason for this might very properly be sought in the narrative. In the first chapter, the usual term God, as God of nature, is sufficient, but he wishes to connect his special work, the creation of man, with God in his covenant relation, or Jehovah as the God of his people. (Ex. 3:13). God that made man in his own image is to redeem him. And so as the God of redemption he uses in the second chapter the term, Jehovah God. Whether this was the only or the main reason for the change of term in the second chapter, can hardly be affirmed very positively, as no reason for the change is given by the writer, but it seems as good a reason as the one invented in these days that he was using another document. Whether the writer used other documents or not, is a matter of no consequence, since by using them he made them his own. From what sources the Evangelist Luke obtained his information about the birth and early days of Jesus we know not. He is responsible for their correctness. And so Moses, or whoever wrote Genesis is responsible for the book as it stands. If there are any disagreements they are his, or the disagreements of the book, or if, as we maintain, these books were inspired, they are divine disagreements. There is no need of mystifying a discussion which ought to be brief and simple, and that is, is the Bible inspired? If so, the writers were

kept from fundamental error. Verbal inspiration makes the writers simply amanuenses or typewriters dictated to, which is not God's way of using men. He uses men as men, as he did Prophets and Apostles, with all their humanities. How much of error may have been allowed to creep in can be determined by criticism, which can and ought to be as sharp and only as sharp as truth will allow. Certainly there is no call to hide any disagreements by old documents for which the writer was not responsible. With reference to the vast array of learning involved in this discussion the following conclusions have been reached. (1) That no substantial agreement has been reached as to results. (2) That the traditional view of the authorship of most of the books of the Bible is accompanied with the fewest difficulties as to facts and doctrines. (3) That it was the evident intention of the Author of Revelation to make a book fairly intelligible to the ordinary mind and not one dependent on the dictum of scholars, whose learning is more of the letter than of the Spirit.

CREATION OF MAN

3. With reference to the creation of man, three things are stated very explicitly in the narrative in Genesis. (1) That it was the last and crowning work of creation. After that God rested, or ceased to make any new forms of life. When the Flood was sent, new forms were not created to take the place of those destroyed. (2) That man

differed in his creation from the animals in being made in the image of God. (3) That all mankind descended from a single pair.

It is well to take up these points in order, as this is the great battleground between science and revelation, and where science has so far claimed the victory that not a few Biblical commentators are found supporting its views. Let us see how the matter stands. And first as to the *Antiquity of man*. It is admitted by Geologists that pre-historic remains of bones closely resembling the human have been found in caves with those of extinct animals. Skeletons have been found, one of a man six feet high, and others shorter. These skeletons showed "fair average human skulls," according to Huxley. Others had marks of inferiority. (Dana's *Geology*, p. 574). This inferiority of structure is generally acknowledged by Naturalists, and if we follow the theory of Evolutionists, man's precursor would necessarily be of a low type. The *Pithican Homopus Erectus* or ape-like man, whose skull was found in Java in 1894, and who was supposed by many to furnish the missing link between man and the ape, was said to have had a brain capacity half way between the lowest man and the highest known type of ape. Besides skeletons, stone implements, charcoal and relics of fire and bone, drawings of animals have been discovered, usually in caves with the bones of fierce animals now extinct, such as the cave bear, cave hyena, cave lions, and the

old elephant, which was one-third larger than the elephant of our own time. These remains belong to the Glacial period, which some think lasted twenty-five thousand years, and the close of which was, say, twelve thousand years ago. The conclusion generally adopted as the result of these scientific investigations is expressed in a book, quite largely used in schools (Redway & Hinman's National Advanced Geography, p. 34), "At one time many thousands of years ago all or nearly all people were more ignorant than the most savage tribes now living. They probably did not know how to make many things, but lived in caves, wore no clothing, and ate only fruits, nuts, roots and such insects as they could catch, and such small animals as they could kill with clubs and stones. At last some one may have learned how to tie a harp stone on the end of a stick and thus make a spear with which to spear fish or kill animals. Then some one may have learned that sticks rubbed together will get hot and at last burn, thus starting a fire."

The question arises, is this conclusion that the so-called Paliolithic or Neolithic man living in caves—the companion of extinct carnivorous animals, was our ancestor, a correct one or not? Our answer is that however near these animals approximated to the human in their physical structure, they were in no sense the being which God made in his own image, and from whom we are descended. (1) The first argument is that the world

was not ready for man at the time it is affirmed that he appeared. In the Biblical narrative one is impressed with the thought that the consummation and crown of the work of creation is man. In the work of the six days God spoke and it was done, but when the creation of man is reached there is deliberation and consultation. And when it goes forward it is in the exaltation of the material form so that it contains as in a temple the likeness of the great God, the supreme Creator of all things. The spiritual in its highest form is united to the material, and that makes humanity and then the work of creation ceases. And as we examine the work of creation from the scientific standpoint, we are brought to the same conclusion, the exaltation of man. It is laying up in storehouses for his use and approaching slowly through different grades of vertebrates, until the apex of the Pyramid is reached in the human, the highest of animals. But the time for that consummation had not been reached in the Glacial period.

In geological formula this was the Tertiary period, followed by the Post Tertiary or Quaternary period. Dana says the Tertiary was the age of mammals and the Quaternary the age of man (Geology, p. 141). At the beginning of the latter the gigantic carnivorous animals passed away with the cold of the Glacial period, and in their place came such animals as the stag family and the ox, or the herbivorous instead of the carnivorous (Geology, p. 589). It was the period too of

continued changes and increase in the land surface of the globe (Ib. p. 588), and of completed river systems, such as the Amazon, Mississippi, Ganges, etc. (p. 587); of the gradual purification of the atmosphere (p. 593), and of the waters of the ocean (p. 593). In fact it was the age for perfecting and finishing the previous acts of creation. It was the house being furnished and made ready for its inhabitant. In the Biblical narrative this completeness of preparation is present. Just as afterwards the Tabernacle and Temple were completed before the Shekinah came to fill with its glory the Holy Place. And if we rightly read Geology there was no readiness for man's appearance until the close of the Glacial period. Prof. Winchell says that it has been nearly unanimously agreed that post glacial time does not exceed ten thousand years, and probably amounts to about eight thousand years. (See note in Dr. Orr's "God's Image in Man," p. 306). There is no intention of using this argument of the unpreparedness of the earth as absolute proof that man has not existed the many milleniums that have been claimed, but it is some satisfaction to find that Geology confirms the historical view and places the creation of man at a period where it seems to properly belong.

2. A second argument is that man, with his spiritual nature and capacities, could only have been made by a direct creative act of God. What is man? He has been described as the sum total

of animals. The vertebrate type which exists in the fish, which is more fully developed in the animal with legs for locomotion, and more or less of brain power finds its perfection in the erect form of man, with mind to carry out his wishes and to direct his hands and feet to go and do as he pleases. As an animal he is the highest and best fitted to govern of all that dwell on the earth. But he is not a mere animal. You only touch the border of his humanity when you say he is the highest of animals. Three characteristics might be mentioned which distinguish him from the mere animal. We might speak of others, which are like buttresses to the bridge which spans the chasm between our two natures—speech and reason seem distinctly human, but the one is made with vocal organs; and animals, as they approach man and seem made for his benefit, have in some measure the reasoning faculty. We pass, therefore, to these features, which belong distinctly to the spiritual and not to the physical part of our nature. First man is a moral being; second a religious, and third an immortal being. First, he is gifted with a moral sense. He approves the right whether he does it or not. An animal feels the obligation of instinct, but the *ought* that represents duty from a moral standpoint he fails to see. This moral faculty or conscience represents not only clearer discernment or intellectual power, but a distinct individuality or will power, coupled with a sense of moral obligation. Nature is more or less a

machine working in grooves and by a power outside of itself. In plant life there is the beginning of individuality, which is more manifest in the animal, as it shows wishes or desires of its own. But in man, whose will is operated upon by motives, individual responsibility assumes a higher form. Another nature—we call it the spiritual—comes in and dominates the physical. He who allows the lower nature to rule is animal in his tastes and appetites. If governed by the higher, by his moral nature or conscience, he is spiritual.

This moral or spiritual nature is still further emphasized when we say man is a religious being. There is in him a tendency to worship and hold fellowship with God. If he knows not the true he seeks the false. In the savage this may show itself in the desire to avert evil. He feels dependent upon some higher being and tries to propitiate his favor in crude or superstitious ways. But the religious nature in its natural normal state hungers after God, as the bird for its nest, or the hart for the water brooks. The spiritual in man can only be satisfied by him who made the spirit, and so it cries out, "My soul thirsteth for God, for the living God."

The same may be said about the longing for immortality. It shows itself even when most crushed out, in care for the dead, in providing for their spirits in the happy hunting ground; but in the soul responsive to its nobler instincts the thought is, "I will be satisfied when I awake in thy

likeness." Likeness to God is certainly not likeness to the animal or the material. That dies, as all things earthly die. But the spiritual lives, even when suffering punishment that is called death. For a spirit once created never becomes non-existent.

We have then in man a nature, which is not merely above all animals, but which is distinct from all that can be developed out of material forms. It is not an evolution, but a gift to the already highly developed animal of something higher, in the bestowment of another nature. Otherwise we destroy the spiritual and make man only material without any link to bind him to God and the spirit world. This seems to be the drift of commentators who, like Canon Driver, follow the evolutionary theory. He holds very positively to the theological fact of the relation of God to the world, but is just as positive about the progress of man from anthropoid ancestors. He defines the image of God as the gift of *self-conscious reason* (p. 15, "Commentary on Genesis") and argues against the high intellectual capacities of our first parents, as Miltonic rather than Biblical (p. 56). It is contrary, he says, to progress, to the gradual advance from lower to higher, from the less perfect to the more perfect which is stamped upon the entire range of organic nature. (p. 56). But surely if God is the Creator he can control and modify the work of his own hands. He can proceed by gradual advance or by leaps

and bounds, if the latter seem necessary. This he has abundantly indicated, not only by the introduction of vegetable and animal life in creation, but the same thing is manifested more or less now. There are not only constant forces acting like water in the erosion of river channels, but eruptive-forces sudden and terrific, as the earthquake. It is hard to tell which has caused the greatest changes on our globe—the eruptive or the erosive. And then the gift of self-consciousness is no gift at all, but simply the result of other endowments. The main thing was the gift of a spiritual nature involving reason, individuality and responsibility. Possessing these he would become conscious of their existence. We are not to hide the gift by specifying only one of its results.

3. Another argument is drawn from our condition since the Fall. It is readily seen that our spiritual nature is not now in the image of God as it came perfect from his hands. We are like a broken statue with the lineaments blurred, but not obliterated. There is in man an approval of that which is good, but a reluctance to perform—a struggle between right understanding and a perverse will; immortal, and yet forgetting his destiny in the present, god-like and yet often basely animal; capable of and often rising to the highest civilization, and yet sinking again to barbarism. This is easily explained by the narrative in Genesis. He was made upright, but fell from the estate in which he was created, by sinning against

God. Adam's nature became corrupt, and his descendants inherited his corrupt nature. According to evolution, man was imperfect before Adam and imperfect since. The Fall came upon him, says Driver, "when he was immature in intellect and culture" (Gen., p. 57). We at once feel that the Fall, which was really a test of man's obedience and a punishment for disobedience, came upon him when he was unprepared to meet it. This is usually met by talking about the Fall as if it were a step in man's upward progress and development.

The claim for the scriptural narrative, therefore, is, (1) That it is the only adequate explanation for the moral, religious and immortal nature which exists in man. (2) That the Fall or corrupt tendency in man now, can only be explained by the same authority which states his original condition and the departure from it. (3) Progressive development in the race, especially in its corrupt state, is due, not to innate forces in man, but to divine grace and power working in and with Revelation, and especially in the gift of his Son.

From our standpoint we are obliged to say that nothing more delusive and subversive of Christianity can be imagined than this theory which starts with the evolution of man from anthropoid ancestors, or the so-called Peliolithic and Nicolithic man in the time of the Glacial period. The same force carries him through the stone, iron

and bronze ages, down to Babylonian and Egyptian civilizations. It makes a myth of the Fall and of innocence and intelligence in the Garden of Eden. It develops monogamy out of polygamy, civilization out of savagery and barbarism, and reaches its haven of the perfect man without miracle, or a divine Christ, or the Holy Spirit. What a sin against the religious nature of man, which so needs help and which has the promise of it so abundantly given in the Word of God. What a sin against him who has given us that nature and so exalted us above the beasts that perish, by linking us to himself, and to another and better life than this.

[NOTE. It might have seemed proper that reference should have been made to Davis' work on the Image of God in man. He goes over the same ground in part as the above, showing the inadequacy of Evolution to account for man's higher and spiritual nature. But the main part of the argument had been written before I learned of the publication of his work.]

CHAPTER III

THE UNITY OF MANKIND

Those who hold to the statement that Adam was made in the image of God, hold also to the view that Eve was the mother of all living. But if man descended from anthropoid ancestors, he was probably made in groups like other animals. Thus Driver says, "All mankind are not descended from a single pair, but arose independently in different centers of the globe," and so he says, "The real unity of the race consists not in unity of blood, but in unity of mental constitution and of moral and spiritual capacities." "Each race," he adds, "independently passed through similar moral experiences, and each similarly underwent a 'fall.'" ("Commentary on Genesis," p. 57). Three fundamental points are here involved: First, The fatherhood of God; Second, The brotherhood of man, and Third, The marriage relation, as between one man and one woman. The first we have already considered in the last chapter, in the fact that God made man in his own image. The brotherhood of man, Driver holds only in a modified form. We are like birds of the same feather, though our pedigree does not go back to the same ancestor. We will take this up a little later on. At present it is to be noticed that there is an inherent improbability that different races possessed with independent wills, should have met the Fall in the

same way. Why did not some escape, as was the case with the angels, when put to a similar test of obedience?

1. MARRIAGE

In discussing the unity of the race it is necessary to say a word about marriage. In reading the account we see the difference between man's creation and that of animals. Not only did God decide to make man in his own image, but he only makes at first a single individual, whereas in animal life, the "waters swarmed with swarms of living creatures." And in providing a suitable companion for man, none could be found in the animal world—none among the descendants of his so-called Anthropoid ancestors, and so out of man he made woman. And then he pronounces on this new pair the great law of marriage, "Therefore shall a man leave his father and his mother and shall cleave unto his wife; and they shall be one flesh." Here was a distinct planning and looking forward to what was best for him and for human society as long as he existed on the earth. And then is it too much to say that he was planning for the best good of man in his brotherly and sympathetic relations to his fellow man? He knew what distinctions would arise in society—how civilization, wealth and station would make barriers in contrast with ignorance, vice and barbarism, and so he removed the greatest barrier by making all men brethren. We are of one blood—have one

Father, one Saviour, one Heaven, is the message to our common humanity. And nothing so stirs our sympathy for the fallen and degraded, as this fact that we are brethren, capable of being elevated and united in the glorious position of Sons of God. That God looked forward to and planned all this in the creation and marriage of our first parents, is what the Bible would have us believe. That human nature in its ignorance and sin should have evolved marriage in the divine sense and meaning, out of promiscuous co-habitation or polygamy is not conceivable. History plainly teaches that there has been no such evolutionary tendency in any of the nations of the earth. The difficulty is in keeping depraved human nature up to the Biblical standard. It is only done by the authority of God, looking, of course, to man's best good individually and socially.

2. UNITY OF THE RACE

Let us proceed therefore with the arguments which we think go to establish the unity of the race from a scientific standpoint. It is well to see that in taking the Bible as it is, we are not teaching antiquated science, but truth which the best investigation has proved to be correct. We need also to dissipate the assumption of superiority which as a part of egoism we are disposed to claim for the Caucasian race. Cultivation and training ought to do for other races all that they have done for us.

There are two theories about race distinctions. One theory would make these distinctions fundamental and radical, involving different race-centers or origins of man—say five or seven. The other theory is that in some remote past, the pre-Adamite race started from a given center—say Lemuria off the east coast of Africa, and became diversified in the lapse of ages, as we now see them.

The argument for race distinctions is founded for the most part on external differences, such as color of the skin, fiber of the hair, projection of face and lips beyond the line of the forehead and alleged differences in brain development. But these differ in the same race, as the Indian in color, from the almost black on the shores of the Rio de la Plata to the almost white Mandans of the upper Missouri. The shaft of the hair is found to differ in the same individual as well as in different races. And within the limits of modern history the Lapps, Finns and Maygars all descending from a common stock, exhibit the most marked differences in skull and general conformation—the Maygars being tall and well made and the Lapps short and uncouth (“Unity of Mankind” by Dr. Cabell, p. 96). It is to be remarked also that these differences are not so great as in some animals—the dog, for example. The following facts, therefore, with respect to the so-called different races can be clearly proved.

First. They are anatomically the same. There

is the same number and variety of bones, the same temperature of blood, the same formation of skin. There is also the same period of arriving at the full development of the physical powers, the average duration of life, the tendency to disease and similarity of diseases. Second. Beyond this the mental and moral constitution are the same. We expect of course variation between the mental caliber of a civilized European and a Hottentot, which in generations would show itself in cranial development; but fundamentally their natures are the same. Allowing for civilization and environment, memory, the reasoning faculties, the distinction between right and wrong, the disposition to worship, the consciousness of sin, the need of forgiveness are all alike in every race. This agrees with the declaration of Paul as he stood in the center of the world's civilization and declared that God "hath made of *one blood* all nations of men" (Acts 17:26).

CHAPTER IV

THE GARDEN OF EDEN AND THE FALL

GENESIS, CHAPTERS 2 AND 3

In continuing the account of man's creation the narrative describes his abode—then the creation of woman and the law of marriage between one man and one woman. After that we have the account of the Fall and the Expulsion from Paradise. The man thought with reference to the works created centers in man.

I. MIST AND RAIN

Before speaking of his abode, an explanation is thrown in of the state of the vegetable world. No plant of the field and no herb had yet sprung up (2:5). That is, the vegetable life suited for man had not yet been created. Vegetation of a different kind, and belonging to the carboniferous period, and such as was needed for the leviathans and carnivorous animals before the herbivorous, but not for the more recent animals. For this previous vegetation, all the moisture required and perhaps in great abundance, was furnished by the mist going up from the yet uncooled earth. Evidently the atmosphere was not purified and did not concentrate the moisture in clouds, and there was no rain.

That which specially interests us is that here is a bit, not of antiquated but of anticipated science,

such as confirms the results of the most recent investigations with regard to the history of our globe. As man could not learn this from tradition, nor from any science then known, the only conceivable source is the inspiration of the Almighty. And to this we look rather than to any Babylonian or Egyptian documents.

2. GARDEN OF EDEN

Man having been made, Jehovah God placed him in a garden "eastward in Eden" (v. 8). From the description the garden was more like a park of considerable extent, with four rivers. Two of these rivers, the Euphrates and Tigris, are identified with rivers of the same name, while the others are in dispute. The location is also in dispute, whether at the mouth of the rivers near the Persian Gulf or at their source in Armenia. Fig leaves and the absence of clothing would suggest the more Southern locality.

This garden, man was to dress and keep (2:15) showing that labor or employment is not inconsistent with a state of innocence and happiness. Free use was granted to all the trees of the garden, with one exception, and that was, the "tree of knowledge of good and evil." The name of the tree indicates another idea beyond the fruit it bore. In this case it was a test of obedience. Obedience would result in knowing the good by experience. There would be the approbation of God and of one's own conscience. Disobedience

would result in knowing the evil and its effects. The test was a simple one, and so the question of obedience was easily understood. Fruit must have been abundant in the garden, and only one tree was forbidden. The tree of life was accessible until after disobedience. This seems a symbol of a truth underlying the whole of Scripture, that life is provided for us by God himself—is his gift, but is withheld from the disobedient. Wherever bestowed it is an invaluable and eternal blessing.

3. THE FALL

The next topic carries us still further into the region of symbols. The tempter appears under the guise of a serpent—a specially fitting emblem, when we consider its cunning in securing its prey and avoiding danger. Some have thought it underwent a change after the curse, and became, what it was not before, a crawling animal. But of this we are not sure. It seemed in no way repulsive to Eve, whereas, since then, all her descendants have looked upon snakes, even when not venomous, with repugnance. The power of speech, we must consider one of Satan's devices and not a mere suggestion to the mind of Eve, without any outward expression. She had not yet become evil so that the depraved nature could be the medium of wicked thought, as with us. The serpent's method however, was the same that the devil pursues with us. As Matthew Henry says, "he questions, first, whether it were a sin or no; second, he denies that

there is any danger in it; third, he suggests much advantage by it. And these are his common methods." He begins very cautiously, by asking what appeared to be an innocent enquiry, "Yea hath God said, ye shall not eat of every tree of the garden?" He seemed to intimate that the command, not to eat, extended to the other trees. To which the woman replies, that this was not so. "We may eat of the fruit of the trees of the garden, but of the fruit of the tree, which is in the midst of the garden, God hath said, ye shall not eat of it, neither shall ye touch it, lest ye die." The not touching, does not appear in the original command, but it is always safe to avoid that which is forbidden. The danger is in holding the parley, even if the law be reaffirmed. It is a gain to the tempter, to get an ear for his evil suggestions. And so he goes on to say, there was no danger in disobedience. "Ye shall not surely die." This was a bold lie, but it might start a doubt about the justice, a certainty of the punishment. And he follows it up by affirming that instead of danger, there would be decided advantage. Ye shall be as God himself—(not as gods—for of false gods Eve knew nothing). He adroitly uses the name of the tree as an assurance that their knowledge should be enlarged. In a sense it would be true, but by a bitter instead of a pleasant experience of evil. And instead of becoming like God, they would be made like Satan, antagonistic to God. So far the tempter ad-

dressed the ear. After this he could afford to be silent, as he sees the temptation working through the eye, as Eve looks at the beauty of the forbidden fruit. It was then an easy step to open transgression—to taking the fruit and giving it to her husband, who thus became a partaker in her act of disobedience.

The first effect of their sin was hiding from him against whom they had sinned; and a sense of shame or guilt in making themselves aprons to cover themselves. The hiding from God reveals to us the terms of friendly intercourse which he had, up to this time shown his children. This was now broken up, and was one of the penalties of disobedience. Man was expelled from the garden and from access to the tree of life. Under harder conditions than before, he was to till the ground and seek to reap from it the fruit of his labors.

4. PUNISHMENT

As this was man's first transgression and as it was far-reaching in its results, it is well to consider what the punishment was, and why it was inflicted. Those who hold to the imperfection of our first parents, would hardly consider the Fall and Expulsion from Eden as a punishment. It was rather a part of the upward progress of the race from savagery to civilization. They would claim that the varied races were involved in the same moral condition as the Adamic race by in-

dependent processes. For all must acknowledge that man as he now exists is a sinful being. How he became so is the difficult question, especially if we do not accept the exact statement of the Biblical narrative. No one would venture the statement that God made man imperfect, and therefore he became sinful. It is almost equivalent to saying he made man sinful, which is repugnant to all our ideas of God. So that we are forced to accept the only other alternative, that God made man perfect, and that as a free agent he fell from that high estate by sinning against God. (See Driver's attempt to avoid this conclusion, Gen. p. 56). When sin has been committed, that it should be punished is a necessity in all government. The Bible treats it as an intuitive truth to be accepted without argument, just as the being of God. If no penalty is inflicted, "the magistrate beareth the sword in vain." Some preach a gospel of rewards and no punishments. But that is not the gospel of the Kingdom of Heaven—nor of any known system of government. What then is the penalty? Death or the opposite of the life promised. Obey, and you have the one. Disobey, and you have the other.

(1) DEATH TO THE BODY

Life was first immortality to both soul and body. Immortality to the soul is, in a sense, natural. It belongs to its very existence. And from the whole tenor of Scripture it is never taken

away. With the body it is different. It is earthly and, like all things of earth, perishes. In creating man in his own image, God endowed this transient material with immortality. As a punishment of sin it was sent back to its original condition. "Dust thou art and unto dust shalt thou return." Some indication of what might have been our lot was given by the prolongation of human life to nearly a thousand years, and by the translation of Enoch without seeing death. This first gift of longevity to the body and then the shortening of man's days on the earth, seems vastly more satisfactory in view of what man is and of what he was made for, than the assertion of Canon Driver "that the longevity here described is physiologically incompatible with the structure of the human body" (Gen. p. 75). It is incompatible with the structure of the body that it should rise again. And yet we believe in that, as a result of divine power. And we believe in it as a restoration to man of all that he lost in the Fall.

With this taking away of the immortality of the body there was inflicted the sorrow and burden, which in this life accompanies sin. The woman was especially to suffer, and the ground was to be cursed for man's sake. Thorns and thistles were to grow spontaneously, and in the sweat of his brow, man was to cultivate the soil. The extra labor involved has in it the seeds of blessing, for labor is better than idleness. It was punishment, as has been witnessed by the sorrows and miseries

of these thousands of years; but not wholly without its consolations. It is a harder task to subjugate nature and ourselves than if we had continued innocent, but there is a greater reward if we come off victorious.

(2) SPIRITUAL DEATH

Death came not only to the body, but to the soul. As the soul continues its existence while the body dies, the main significance of death is not in the outward and material. The particulars involved show, however, that it is a fearful reality. There is (1) Alienation from God—manifest in hiding from God, as our first parents did in the garden. (2) Subjugation of the higher nature to the lower. The reverse of this was the teaching of man's whole organization. As an animal, the brain, not size or strength, was the dominating faculty. Through centuries, life in animal was progressing from mollusk to vertebrate, and from vertebrate in fish to vertebrate in animal. And from vertebrate in animal with his four paws for locomotion, to the upright position in man and with his brain using hand and arm for higher purposes than instinct ever suggested. And then crowning all, comes the supreme work of God, subjecting brain to the control of moral power, representing God within us and God over and above all his works. When Eve listened to the serpent it was rebellion against the fundamental law of our being. Disobedience was disorder, con-

fusion, anarchy, not only in man, but in the whole realm of nature that sympathized with his fallen condition. (3) In this state man could no longer do good, and (4) was prone to evil. With reference to the two last features, subsequent history furnished abundant evidence.

(3) DEATH ETERNAL

Eternal death follows necessarily from death of soul and body. Once begun, it must continue to man and his descendants, as long as the alienation from God lasts. How long this alienation shall last and how it can be removed, depends on him against whom sin has been committed. That there was hope of restoration is intimated in this connection. But the first thought is the making clear that suffering and punishment follow sin. The law is guarded first on the side of justice and then afterward on the side of mercy and forgiveness. God who made man knows just what he needs in the way of strength of motive, to keep him in the path of virtue and obedience.

(4) THE FIRST PROMISE OR PROTEVANGELISM

Lest our first parents should sink into despondency, there came with this infliction of punishment, the foreshadowing of the conflict between right and wrong and obedience and disobedience. It was to be a conflict vastly prolonged. It was to be waged through the ages between the great spiritual forces represented by sin, evil and Satan

on the one hand, and on the other by conscience, the obligation to do right, and especially God in Christ. The seed of the woman was to bruise the head of the serpent and the serpent was to bruise his heel. After ages of this conflict, and since Christ has appeared in the flesh, no clearer description has been given of the fight and the ultimate victory than in this brief sentence—this ray of hope, as Adam and Eve were thrust out of Paradise. Here is prophecy begun by Him who knows all from the beginning to the end.

(5) SACRIFICE

In connection with this promise, comes an indication of regard for the guilty pair. It is said, "Jehovah God made for Adam and for his wife coats of skins and clothed them." (3:21). How much this implies it is difficult to say. From the fact that sacrifices are spoken of in the next chapter, it does not seem an improper inference that they were now instituted and that the skins were from beasts, slain for that object. If so, a great truth is here symbolized that through sacrifice, the nakedness of the soul is covered by the righteousness which God has provided by the substitution of a victim in the place of the offender. How far our first parents realized the truth thus set forth it is impossible to say. Eve seemed to hold by faith to the promise in calling her first-born as one gotten from the Lord, or as some think it should be translated, "I have gotten a

man—Jehovah”—as if not only the promise of bruising the head of the serpent was to be fulfilled in this boy, but that the boy himself was Jehovah-God manifest in the flesh. However, while some see too little in the record, we would not go to the other extreme, of finding more than the type and shadow of things to come.

CHAPTER V

CAIN AND ABEL

GENESIS, CHAPTER 4

This chapter is a sequence to the story of the Fall, and shows that the sin of our first parents involved their offspring. Of the sinfulness of the whole race there can be no doubt. Two ways of explaining it are common among theologians. One is that by nature we are children of wrath. The old law of like producing its like is true of man in his spiritual nature. Born of parents, who after the Fall, were corrupt, we partake of their corruption. Another idea is that of federal headship. As we partake of the blessings of Christ, the second Adam, by coming into covenant relation with him through faith, so through the first Adam we share in the results of his transgression. The two explanations melt into each other, as we view them from the standpoint of the first or second Adam.

(1) THE FIRST MURDER

That the first-born of our race should be a murderer, and that too of his own brother, is not a pleasant fact to read about, so soon after the creation of man in God's image and the placing him innocent in the Garden of Eden. And then how strange that the brother who was so unsuspecting, and who was accepted by God in his wor-

ship, was not kept from harm by the Almighty; when at the same time he condescended to reason with and protect the wicked brother. Thus early are we taught that the rewards of the righteous are not in this life. We are also taught the long-suffering and patience of God towards the worst of criminals.

The occasion of Cain's anger against his brother, was because Abel's sacrifice was accepted of God, while his was not. Adam doubtless acted as priest in his own family, just as Abraham did, until his sons were grown and had households of their own. Cain and Abel were engaged in rural occupations—the one a tiller of the ground, the other a keeper of sheep.

(2) SIGNIFICANCE OF SACRIFICE

At the end of days, which some suppose was the Sabbath, others the end of the year, or at the time of harvest, they came with their sacrifice. Both brought of the fruits of their toil, and so far as expressions of thankfulness were concerned, this was the proper method. Cain may have argued, I am a tiller of the ground, and I bring these fruits as a token of gratitude. This is natural religion, and from a human standpoint, was correct. But it did not meet with the divine approval. In what way that approval was manifested is not certain. Many think that as in later times, the sacrifice of Abel was consumed by fire. If not in that way, it was made plain to Cain that

his offering was not accepted. In the Epistle to the Hebrews, it is said that "by faith, Abel offered a more excellent sacrifice than Cain" (11:4). If by faith, there must have been some previous instruction as to the method and object of sacrifice. As a thank-offering, and without any revelation of the divine will, Cain's offering was as appropriate as Abel's. But if God had signified that he preferred another way, then that way must be followed. How far our first parents were instructed as to the nature of sacrifice and its connection with the promised deliverer, Revelation does not inform us. We suppose light on this matter became clearer as the time approached for Christ's coming. Possibly all they knew was that sacrifice was to be of the firstlings of the flock. This meant expiation—substitution of life for life. Doubtless there was a tendency to the idea of Cain, that a sacrifice was simply a thank-offering, or as they were called by the Greeks, the *food and drink* of the gods. Thus Homer "describes Jupiter and the rest of the gods, as going from Olympus to a festal sacrifice, which the Ethiopians presented to him, and which lasted twelve days" (Knapp's "Theology," p. 380). The same idea is expressed in the cooked sacrifices, or offerings of the Chinese. In connection with this festal idea, there is also ample evidence of the idea of expiation, or at least appeasing the anger of the gods. Hence it was believed that the more precious the victim, and the more nearly connected

with the offerer, the more certainly would the gods be appeased. Hence the splendid hecatombs mentioned by Homer, and hence human sacrifices and the offering of children by their own parents. Asar says of the Gauls, "that unless the life of a man was given for the life of men, they did not think that the immortal gods could otherwise be appeased." (See Hill's "Divinity," p. 443). It is not necessary to claim that this expiatory idea of sacrifice was handed down by tradition from our first parents, though that certainly is probable. To this may have been added the yearnings of our fallen nature to find a way of reconciliation to God. There is certainly no evidence that the typical idea so constantly prominent in Scripture and which kept the Jews from excess as in offering human sacrifices, was ever present, except in connection with revelation. And yet the typical, as well as the expiatory idea, was always a part of acceptable sacrifice. It must have been so with Abel; for his offering was acceptable through faith in the future and not merely because of obedience to a divine command. Cain's offering was without faith; and so he neglected both the typical and the expiatory idea. And yet he was, in his way, religious. He brought an offering to the Lord. From this it is evident that mere worship is not sufficient. The external performance of what we may think duty may not be acceptable in the sight of God. Without faith it is impossible to please him. Shut out of Paradise, man's hope

is in God's way of return and not by seeking to climb over the wall.

This explanation of the meaning of sacrifice and the reason why Cain's offering was not accepted is more in accord with the fundamental thought of the Old Testament in looking at the future, than the less prominent but important idea of regarding our motives in the worship of God. (This last is Driver's explanation, *Gen.*, p. 64).

The acceptance of Abel's sacrifice, while his was rejected, stirred up envy and anger in the breast of Cain. His countenance fell and he was very wroth. Notwithstanding his unreasonable anger, God reasons with Cain. He reminds him that he knew enough of God to know that his dealings were right—that if he did well he should be accepted, but if not, sin lay at the door. There are two interpretations of this last clause. One that if he did not do well, repent and sin, that is, a sin-offering, lay at the door. Come with the appointed sacrifice and be accepted. The other interpretation personifies sin as lying in wait at the door. Sinful passion lay as a ravenous beast to devour him; but thou shouldst rule over it, conquer the rising temptation before it is too strong for thee, and subdue it. Driver, who holds the latter view, adds, "It teaches a profound psychological truth, the danger of harboring a sullen and unreasoning discontent. It is a temper which is only too likely to lead to fatal consequences, and

which therefore as soon as it begins to show itself should at all costs be checked." ("Commentary on Genesis," p. 65).

The reasoning of God seemed, however, to have no effect on Cain. He concealed his wrath for a time, talking with Abel under the guise of friendship, and waiting until they could be alone in the field. And then he rose up against his brother and slew him.

Notwithstanding the sin of Cain, God still reasoned with him and did not visit his crime with the punishment it deserved. He was to bear the burden of his sin in a life cursed. By some visible mark it was known that he was God's prisoner and was not to be killed. It is evident as we read on that the curse was not in the deprivation of worldly comforts and blessings. For the descendants of Cain were the inventors of that period, not only in useful arts, but in music as well.

It is to be feared that the forbearance of God had but little effect on Cain and his posterity, for we read that Lamech, the seventh from Adam, was a polygamist and murderer, and seemed to boast as if he should escape punishment as Cain did before him (4:23, 24). As Abel received not the rewards of righteousness in this life, so Cain and his descendants were not punished for their evil deeds in the present. Cain undoubtedly felt the remorse of his guilty deed, but unwilling to accept the advice of God, went out, as the nar-

rative reads, "from the presence of Jehovah" (4:16). He left the region where his parents resided and where we suppose they still sacrificed to God, while he himself would no longer worship in a way which had proved unacceptable. Governed by his fears he built a city, not in our modern sense, but a fortified dwelling place.

(3) SETH

As Abel had been slain and Cain had gone eastward, a new successor of the promise was granted in the person of Seth. This line of promise towards the Messiah is one kept carefully in view, if not by the human historian, yet by God himself. Other sons and daughters were born to our first parents and their descendants, but the history never loses sight of the seed of the woman and of his personal name, that was to bruise the head of the serpent. This personal mention does away with the speculation indulged in by some that we have in these chapters the names of tribes, instead of persons.

In this line of Seth we come to an interesting record in the days of his son Enoch that "then men began to call on the name of Jehovah." (4:26). What had been the neglect, and what was the occasion for this new interest we are not informed. Incidentally we learn that some 250 years after the Fall, there was such an increase in the human family that history takes on the usual parlance of what belongs to the nation

rather than the individual. This service of Jehovah which began in Enoch's time seems to be one of those glimpses which we have of the spiritual life before the Flood.

(4) ENOCH

A second glimpse comes several generations later in the time of Enoch, who, like Lamech of the line of Cain, was the seventh from Adam. He, apparently roused by the defiance and recklessness of such men as Lamech, who gloried in their "exemption from punishment" prophesied that "the Lord would come with ten thousand of his holy ones to execute judgment and convict the ungodly of their deeds" (Jude 14 and 15 vs). Enoch's translation to the presence of God was a still further lesson to those of that age that the rewards of righteousness were in the future. Long life was a temptation to indulge in wickedness, and so man's days were shortened. Enoch only lived out about half of the usual period of man's days; and was not for God took him. Perhaps his translation indicated the way in which we would have been taken to another world if our first parents had not sinned.. The third and last glimpse of the spiritual life of this period shows a state of sad decline in those who represented the Sons of God.

(5) SONS OF GOD

At first sight we might imagine that those thus

designated were angelic beings (as in Job 38:7) and thus get the sanction of Scripture to the lustful idea of the gods of the heathen, but we remember that man was made in God's image and so was entitled to be called his son. And that among the descendants of Adam there were those like Abel who worshipped aright, and that in Enoch's time, there were those who, responsive to the original longings of man after God, sought him, and that there were men like Enoch and Noah who walked with God, and we also know from human experience, that those thus walking and called his sons, might fall into sin as Israel and the church have done, so we conclude that there were a goodly number among the descendants of Seth who had earned the right to the title of Sons of God, as in these days we have of being called Christians.

(6) GENERAL CONCLUSIONS

Doubtless all attentive readers of these first chapters of Genesis, are struck with the brevity of the record. Here are ten generations covering a period of two thousand years (according to the Hebrew, 1656 and the Seventy 2262) and after the story of the Creation and the Fall, a short chapter covers the ground from Adam to Noah. But what is written is sufficient to admirably fit into the plan of a Revelation of salvation for man.

First comes the origin of man—made in the image of God.

Second, how he became sinful.

Third, the consequences of that sinful state. (a) in man's depraved nature; (b) in the punishment inflicted upon sin.

The character of God appears in clear accord with subsequent revelation (1) *Just* in the punishment of sin. (2) *Merciful* (a) in the promise of victory to the seed of the woman; (b) in sacrifice which looked to a substitute for man's sin; (c) in long-suffering to the sinful and rebellious; (d) in intimations that immortality would be granted to those who walked with God.

Still further there were some lessons about *sin*. In its simplest form sin is an act of disobedience. But it is against God, who has placed man in the highest position a creature, who is in one sense an animal, could occupy. He was linked to God, with the implied thought that dominion belonged to the higher nature. He yielded to the lower nature—acted contrary to the laws and position in which God placed him. Disobedience in the moral world was like inaccuracy in the physical. The motion of the planets is free and smooth in their orbits, admitting also of special movements, yet the accuracy of revolution is absolute, admitting of no variation even to the thousandth part of a second. So in the sphere of moral revolution obedience should be simple, absolute, and unquestioning to the Father and Ruler

of all. While man is a free moral agent and is thus responsible for his own choice, there is here clearly stated the agency of the devil in tempting man—a fact which is recognized through the whole of subsequent revelation. 3. We have here an admirable study in Psychology: (1) The methods of attack on the part of the tempter. (2) The yielding and excuses on the part of the tempted. (3) The growth of envy into hatred and murder. (4) The way of escape offered and resisted, and the effect of remorse and fear. Here are pictures of actual reality, true in every age, and plainly indicative of the need of divine help, as the tendency of man to go astray is seen to be so strong.

CHAPTER VI

CHRONOLOGY

Before proceeding with the next great physical fact, it may be well to say a few words with reference to Chronology. Chronology is only the dry bones of history. History begins with man—with Adam, according to the Bible. Adam was created in God's image, as the last and highest of the animal creation, and for whom all the other parts of creation had been made subservient. In this science agrees perfectly with revelation. *When* he was created is in a measure pointed out by both in perfect harmony with one another. It would naturally be, when all things were made ready for his appearance. Certainly it would not be in the carboniferous period, when the atmosphere was not purified and when the animals were not suited to his tastes and wants. Nor would it be in the time of cave-bears, cave-lions, hyenas and other carnivorous beasts, when some have fancied the bones of our ancestors have been found. It would not have been before or in the intense cold of the Glacial period, when many types of animals were destroyed. But a more fitting time would be when the garden, like the earth, of which it was a part, was complete—when its continents with up-heaved mountain ranges and river systems, received their final adjustment, when the grapes, grains and fruits for man's use,

and for the birds, fishes and animals that were to be his companions and helpers had been created—then and not till then would seem the time to introduce man into the world over which he was to have dominion. Through successive stages and during many long periods of time, the construction of the pyramid had been going on, and the lines converging towards the Apex, and when it had been reached in man, the image of his Creator, what else could be expected than that the work of creation should cease? Can we through science, approximate to the time of this consummation and completion? The first attempts to compute the time geologically were from the time occupied in the erosion of rivers, as for example, the Niagara gorge. At first Lyell thought that it must have taken one hundred thousand years to have worn back the rock to its present position. More careful observations have made great reductions in this estimate, and now the general consensus of authority is that “the post-glacial time cannot be more than ten thousand years, and probably not more than seven thousand.” (See Dr. Orr’s “God’s Image in Man,” p. 175). How strikingly near this comes to Biblical representation of the time when man appeared, is apparent. We have two witnesses, one stating that man was created about six thousand years ago, and the other declaring that the world was not ready for his appearing until a period ranging from seven to ten thousand years ago, and inclining to the

smaller number. In view of this argument there are certain conclusions that may be put down as highly probable, though they have been disputed by critics of high authority.

1. As to man's appearance on the earth, the conclusion from these two witnesses is that it was comparatively recent. Prof. Kent, however, affirms that the combined evidence of archæology, anthropology and geology indicate that man has existed on the earth at least twenty-five thousand and probably one hundred thousand years." ("Historical Bible," vol. 1, p. 5). This of course is to allow time for the evolution of man from anthropoid ancestors. It is not necessary to repeat the arguments (see above, p. 50) to show that the gap between animal and man cannot be bridged by time, however long, but by the creative power of God. And as we have just stated, geology in the progressive stages of its development was not ready for man's appearance until the post-glacial period.

2. *History.* We reach a much more precise and definite period as to the beginnings of history than that which comes to us from any other source. It is no little satisfaction to have mists and cloud-lands of fabulous record cleared away by the sunlight of a simple and authoritative statement. Thus according to Berosus, ten kings before the Flood reigned for 432,000 years. The last of these was Xinthros who reigned 64,800 years, and is supposed to correspond to Noah.

(See Driver's "Genesis," p. 80). These absurdly fabulous periods of the historians are paralleled by the ages of the Paliolithic and Neolithic man, the stone age, the iron age, etc., before our savage ancestors reached civilization. The strange thing about this civilization, which blossomed out so vigorously, say from 4000 to 5000 B. C., is that it was hardly surpassed by later developments. The monuments make mention of sculptors, brick-makers, carpenters, masons, smiths, including those who worked in gold and silver, jewellers, potters, miners and weavers and basket workers. Cuniform writing had been invented, the length of the solar year (365 1-4 days) had been determined, and eclipses predicted. (See "Historical Bible," pp. 6-7). Prof. Clay in his book, "Light on the Old Testament from Babel," refers to a silver vase, the date of which he gives as 4100 B. C. This vase with its engravings of birds and animals, is so elaborate a piece of workmanship—"comparable in many respects with our own," that one could hardly believe it to be of so ancient a date (p. 52). This early civilization came as a surprise to those who imagined that long ages were necessary to the development of art and industry in our savage ancestors, but it is just what we might expect if our first parents were created in the image of God and lived on for nearly a thousand years. Long experience and native ability would have made them proficient not only in meeting necessities, but in the invention of

those things pertaining to ease and luxury. And so we read in the brief record of their inventing instruments of music as well as making instruments of brass and iron (4:21 and 22). And then when a vessel was needed to save themselves and the animals from destruction by the Flood, they had all the art and capacity necessary for such an undertaking. God directed as to the main features, but the details were left to Noah and his helpers.

A corrected chronology is therefore much briefer and more in accordance with the facts of the case as revealed by the monuments of the past. This is its broad general aspect. When we come to the question of centuries—much remains to be adjusted. In the sacred record the ruling idea is to give the line of succession culminating in Christ—the seed of the woman. Its accuracy in this respect is unquestioned. But yet it has not seemed necessary to mention all the names. We have examples of such omission by comparing Ezra 7:1-5 with 1 Chron. 6:3-14, where, according to the latter, six consecutive names have been dropped. If no names are omitted in the ancestry of Moses, his grandfather had 8,600 male descendants and probably as many female in Moses' lifetime (Num. 3:27, 28). In the familiar ancestry of David only six or seven names cover a period of four hundred and eighty years. (See Ruth 4:18 and 1st Kings 6:1). Readers of the Bible will also notice that while we have independent records of

years up to the time of Abraham, we have none before that to the Deluge, and none between the Deluge and Creation. (See various articles of Prof. W. Henry Green on the Pentateuch). How much allowance should be made for such omissions of names, it is hard to say. This much is certain, that the Chronology given in the margin of the English Bible, which is known as Ushers' and which is shorter than any other, is not necessarily to be followed as correct. This gives the date of Creation as 4004 B. C. and of the Flood as 2348 B. C.

A question arises, Are there any dates so positively fixed by Babylonian or Egyptian Chronology as to make any change necessary in the Biblical statement so far as dates are known? A brief summary of facts as given by the best authorities will show that a brief lengthening of the short chronology of Usher is all that is needed. In Babylon the date of the reign of the first king, Sargon 1st, is given as 3800 B. C. Before this there were nomadic kings or rulers of tribes often settled in cities. This previous civilization is supposed to have extended back to 5000 B. C. Sargon became the first world conqueror, and under his son Naram-Sin, inscriptions are found as far West as the island of Cyprus. In Egypt a similar state existed—first tribal rule and then consolidation into the Northern and Southern Kingdoms. The Northern, comprising the Delta was probably earlier and more advanced than that of

the valley above. Braested mentions the discovery of the calendar year of 365 days by astronomers living in 4241 B. C. (p. 35 of his history of Egypt), a discovery which is ascribed by others to Babylonians (see above, p. 116), writing in hieroglyphics and in a more cursive style was probably introduced about this time. The two kingdoms of the North and South in Egypt were united under Menes in the year 3400 B. C. At one time he was said to have reigned 11,000 years before the Christian Era. Historic civilization is placed by Petrie and others at 5000 B. C.

It is seen therefore that a high state of civilization existed before the Deluge; and that it corresponded in point of time to the inventive era mentioned in Genesis. How to account for this is the question which spontaneously arises in the mind of every thoughtful reader. The evolutionary theory is that it gradually arose from savagery and barbarism through a long period of thousands of years. But observation during the historic period does not confirm this theory. The two ways out of savagery to civilization* which are known to men are either by God's direct agency as in the call of Abraham and of the prophets and especially by the mission of Christ, or by the Church taking the initiative and intro-

*Dr. Whately in his Lecture on the "Origin of Civilization" makes the following remark: "Facts are stubborn things and that no authenticated instance can be produced of savages that ever did emerge unaided from that state is no story but a statement hitherto never refuted of a matter of fact." (Quoted by Dr. Orr in his work "God's Image in Man," p. 187.)

ducing the seeds of new ideas. In every case the intellectual uplift has been through the moral, or else it has been temporary and lapsed into barbarism. The only satisfactory solution therefore, is the Biblical, that God made man upright, with mental and moral capacities of the highest order—waiting only for their development and growth in earthly surroundings. Man's long life before the Flood gave him exceptional advantages for this development, through the seeds of corruption, were working within him. At length moral corruption set in, as we are told in Genesis, and the devotion to idolatry in Babylon and Egypt is abundantly confirmed by the monuments. And nothing is more evident than the debasing effects of idolatrous worship on those who practise it. The tendency downward was not arrested by the severe punishment of the Deluge. And thus came in the savage state by departure from God, and not by the inherent weakness of our anthropoid ancestors.

A third conclusion crowns the record. Since we find that in every point the Biblical account best agrees with the facts as recorded in nature—in man's constitution, condition and early history, we have no hesitation in ascribing it to the same divine care, which called Abraham and sent Christ into the world, and say, it is a Revelation from God. Some of the facts could not be known by man; others could be handed down by tradition. And so God and man co-operated as in all works

pertaining to man's salvation. But I marvel at two things: First, the brevity of the record when it had to do with those "men of renown" living before the Flood; and second, its constant adherence to the great truth of one God, the Creator and Governor of the world, while all other literature is persistently saturated with idolatry. And so we consider the record God-inspired, rather than derived from Babylon or any other human source.

A fourth conclusion is somewhat anticipatory. The long lives of the Antediluvians had not only their effect on civilization, but in the increase of population during these two thousand years. How far man was scattered over the globe and how numerous the population, it is impossible to say. We cannot tell about the destruction of life by wars, pestilence, and other calamities. Neither do we know positively about the rate of increase, whether the same as in our day augmented by the great longevity of the Antediluvians. Prof. Townsend however, makes the calculation of the population of the earth in the thirteenth century after Creation, on the basis of doubling every thirty-three and a half years, instead of every twenty-five, to have been sixteen hundred and forty-nine billions, two hundred and sixty-five millions (p. 50, "Deluge History or Myth"). This seems almost incredible when we have been accustomed to think from the brief history of the few names mentioned, that the population of

the globe could not have extended beyond the Euphrates and Mediterranean basins. But probably two thousand years elapsed between Creation and the Deluge, or say the same length of time as from the birth of Christ to the present, and how rapid have been the changes. And so we are to remember what might have been accomplished by the migrations and civilization of a stalwart race living as many centuries as we do years. Prof. Townsend's calculation implies a dense population reaching to the remotest corners of the earth. He thinks, and there are reasons advocated by others, that North and South America were more accessible before the Deluge than now, and that there has been a subsidence of the connection between New Guinea and Australia and of the islands in the South Pacific. Perhaps there was in that portion of the globe a vast continent of which we see the mountain peaks and ranges in the Hawaiian and other groups of islands. There will be occasion to refer to this subject again in the next chapter. It is alluded to now to show that it may be necessary to rectify our thinking about the civilization and population of the globe in the Antediluvian period.

It will be seen that no attempt has been made to adjust chronology to any given standard, but merely to show that adjustability is possible; and also to show that science and revelation, so far from being antagonistic, are really in harmony and like mortice and tenon fit into one another in supporting the truth.

CHAPTER VII

THE FLOOD

GENESIS, CHAPTERS 6, 7, AND 8 .

In considering this topic there are two aspects which require attention—one is the physical fact and the other the moral, or the Deluge as a punishment of sin and the escape therefrom by Noah and his family. As a physical fact it is only one, perhaps the last of many subsidences of the land, which have taken place on a large scale in the geological history of the globe. We often think there is nothing so stable as the solid ground. But the most permanent and changeless thing in its past history has been the water. Dry land was first called out of the deep, and evidence is abundant everywhere of constant elevations and depressions. Coal beds were elevated and the rank vegetation grew luxuriantly, and then it was sealed up by depression and compression under water and often under stratified rock, and in many cases, elevated again and the process repeated.

With regard to the depression accompanying the Noachian Deluge, which is indicated by “the fountains of the great deep being broken up,” there are two questions (1) when did it occur? and (2) was it universal? There are some facts, however, which it is well to mention before deciding these questions very positively. First, Geologists agree that prior to the appearance of man,

there was a disappearance of the large carnivorous animals. Mr. Alfred Wallace in his work on the "Distribution of Animals," speaks "of the recent and almost universal change that has taken place in the character of the fauna on the entire globe" (Vol. 1, p. 149). Not only has this taken place with regard to cave-lions, bears, etc., but armadillos, large horses and tapirs. And in Australia kangaroos as large as an elephant are among the extinct fauna. With reference to this sweeping away of so many large and fierce animals, he says it was an item of mercy in the judgment of the flood, for it made the world a better habitation for man (Ib. Vol. 1, p. 150). The use of the word "flood," was doubtless an inadvertence by Mr. Wallace, for he thinks that this change in the fauna of the globe took place at the time of the Glacial epoch, some fifty or one hundred thousand years ago. We are inclined to accept the conclusion that the Glacial epoch and its accompanying cold is largely responsible for the decrease of the gigantic carnivorous animals. But there are some animals, notably the Mastodon, that seem to have become extinct at a later period. Their bones have been found near the surface in bogs or peat beds, and in their stomachs remains of twigs of trees, representing the present flora of our globe.

In this connection it is well also to notice another fact. Since the Glacial epoch there is evidence of a submergence of at least a great part

of the northern hemisphere under the waters of the sea. The deposit made by this submergence consists of marine gravel, or, as it is called from its character in certain localities, inundation mud. Thus one of the hills in the Snowden range in North Wales is covered with a marine gravel at a level of 1,130 feet above the sea. And this gravel contains shells in abundance—all of existing species. Prof. Presturch says that the same submergence prevailed over the whole of Ireland, the whole of Wales, all the center and north of England, and over the whole of Scotland. A large part of Russia and all Northern Germany are also included. Italian geologists report gravels with three hundred kinds of existing shells, piled up at elevations of twenty-four hundred feet above the Mediterranean. Charles Darwin speaks of massive marine gravels in Patagonia and their connection with the destruction of the great mammalia of South America. (See Duke of Argyll's paper in "Nineteenth Century Magazine," Jan., 1891, p. 24). The question arises, was this submergence synchronous with the Flood? In discussing this question, it is necessary to free ourselves from the present stable conditions of land and water. Subsidence and elevation seem to have been a part of the continuous history of the earth after the Glacial period. Oceans swept over parts of what is now dry land. And great lakes with immense outlets covered large parts of continents. In addition to what has been said on a previous

page about the condition in Europe, it is said that the great lakes of our own land were one vast body of water, and the Mississippi, fifty miles wide. This period is called the Champlain period when the lake which gives the names, must have reached the Highlands of the Hudson River Valley, and the St. Lawrence was an arm of the ocean, five hundred feet deep at Montreal. It was probably in this period that the great loess deposits along the banks of the Hoang-ho in China were made (Dana's Geology, pp. 354 and 661). Of course with these floods, the erosion of river beds was greater than now. But there was another force in prominent action, and that is earthquakes. Not only was there the upheaval of mountain ranges, the twisting and scattering of rocks, but also change of river channels, which have been made more complete by the action of water. The great canons of the Rockies and the present channel of the Hudson River through the Highlands testify to the mighty power, which was so prevalent at that time all over the earth. We would not therefore confound this period of great floods, great convulsions, upheaving of mountain ranges, digging out channels of rivers, fashioning soil and climate, with the period of a completed earth and that milder and shorter catastrophe of the Noachian Deluge, when man had been placed in possession of his abode and was punished for his sin.

It is to be acknowledged then that this view

of the succession of events after the Glacial period makes it a little uncertain about ascribing the presence of marine shells and other marks of inundation to these earlier subsidences or to the Noachian Deluge. There is, for example, in the Hudson River Valley evidence of drift of clay, gravel and sand under water, belonging apparently to the convulsive period after the Glacial, when a way was opened to the sea through the granite of the Highlands. Later than this, if our conceptions are correct, comes a destruction of large animals different from those destroyed by glacial cold—such, for example, as the Mastodon found near the surface, and having in their stomachs undigested twigs of spruce and fir. (Dana, p. 567). This looks like an effect of the waters of the Flood, and if corroborated by other evidence would be an argument for the universality of the Flood. For the Mastodon was an inhabitant of Europe as well as of America. But the time has not come to be positive about the universality of the Deluge from Geology alone.

Let us proceed, therefore, to consider other arguments for its universality and also such objections as it seems necessary to notice. (1) It is said by some that there is not water enough on the earth to cover the highest mountains. This is doubtless true if we suppose that an extra quantity was needed to cover mountains five miles high. But the subsidences of the land, which have often occurred at different periods of the

world's history would solve that problem. The fountains of the great deep were broken up, as well as accompanied with a continued and heavy rain fall.

(2) Another difficulty is the size of the ark and the number of animals to be accommodated. But it was evidently constructed for its carrying capacity. And it is to be remembered that it was built on the plan of him who knew what was needed, and for the purpose of rescuing so much of animal life as he did not wish to be destroyed.

(3) In connection with this gathering of animals to the ark, there comes the question, how wide was the range from which they were gathered? From the immediate vicinity it would not be a matter of great difficulty. But when seas had to be crossed, as in the case of the Marsupial or Kangaroo family, from Australia, or the North American bison or the Armadillo of South America or the limited range, say of birds of Paradise; and then back again to their former habitat, without leaving some trace of their origin where the Deluge is known to have occurred, the difficulty assumes proportions which has led not a few to contend for a limited rather than a universal Deluge. It is to be noted, however, that the existing species of all these animals, is not more than one-third the size of those that have passed away. "In South America over one hundred species of extinct Quaternary quadrupeds have been made out." (Dana, p. 568). This

Quaternary period is the period of man, but how early in it he was created, and whether the extinction of the larger animals was owing to the Flood or to previous subsidences; and if to the Flood, how the present species reached their present habitat, are questions which are still under discussion.

(4) Those who hold to a limited Deluge also hold that there is no hiatus or break in the civilization before and after the Flood. It would seem as though this should be the case; and possibly if more thorough investigation were made with this thought in view, such break would be found. But it is remarkable that in the Scripture narrative where the punishment is sent to correct the evil in man, there seems but little break in the tendency to idolatry. Noah lived after the Flood, three hundred and fifty years, and must have been a worshipper of Jehovah all his days, but his descendants went sadly astray, with the exception of such sporadic cases as Melchisedec, and probably the patriarch Job.

The idea of a limited Deluge is followed by two classes of expositors. One class, seeing the difficulty about the distribution of animals in gathering them over seas and sending them back to their former habitat, have adopted the view that man where he existed (that is, in the Mediterranean and Euphrates basins) was overtaken and punished by the Flood, but the rest of the world was undisturbed, and that this answered all the

purposes intended as a punishment upon man. The language of universality was used from the writer's standpoint, as Paul speaks of the gospel as preached to every creature under heaven (Col. 7:28). There is no intention on their part of denying the original record.

Another class of expositors—represented by Canon Driver—go still further, and maintain that the true origin of the Biblical narrative about the Flood is found in the Babylonian story, and that it was confined to the narrow limits of the Tigris Euphrates valley. It is true that the Babylonian story has many points in common with the Biblical statement, as the gathering of animals, the sending out of birds. But it falls far short in not recognizing one God and the great purpose for which the judgment was sent. In the Bible it is a punishment for sin with the great typical idea of escape through faith and obedience to God's command. In the Babylonian story it is the mere saving of life when a city was to be destroyed through the anger of the gods. And in the details the ship is seven stories like a pagoda on land with the unnecessary additions of rudder and mast, while the ark is simply a floating refuge with the proper three stories, and designed for its carrying capacity. And if the Flood was limited to the Euphrates Valley, why was it necessary to gather not only clean but unclean animals and creeping things, since the earth could have been easily supplied with such creatures from the regions not overflowed.

But more directly let us notice the arguments for the universality of the Deluge.

PROOFS OF UNIVERSALITY

1. It was universal with respect to man. This is hardly assented to, by those who hold that the Flood was confined to the Euphrates basin. But those who think it was limited with respect to animal life generally believe that it reached all mankind, as it was sent upon them as a punishment for their sin. The impression in reading the Bible is that as it only relates events connected with nations residing in Egypt, Eastern Europe and Western Asia, that man had not penetrated to the regions beyond. But when we consider that two thousand years probably elapsed between Creation and the Flood, and that the increase of the human family with their long lives was far greater than at present, the conclusion of Prof. Townsend that the population of the globe was up among the billions, seems correct. (See above, p. 127). We know that the Israelites increased in two hundred and fifteen years from seventy souls to six hundred thousand armed men, or about two millions, all told. It is necessary therefore to correct our first impressions about the limited part of the globe occupied by man in the time of Noah, and suppose that the race was spread abroad wherever there was the means of subsistence. Ships may have been no new thing when the ark was built, as recent discoveries have shown that they were not in Solomon's time.

2. A second argument in favor of the universality of the Deluge is the language and thought of the Bible. True, many have been disposed to limit the language to the then known world. But II. Peter 3: 5-7 can only mean that as the whole material world had been destroyed by water, so it should be by fire. Strong as is this language, even more strong seems the argument from the evident thought of God in revelation. For two thousand years men were left to see if they would seek after God. They had the argument from his works spread out before them. They dug for iron and worked the precious metals, and pondered the movement of star and planet and fixed with accuracy the Solar year, and yet found not wisdom (See Job 28), except the so-called Sons of God for a time, and they went astray with the crowd. And beyond that the severe judgment of the Flood was not a remedy against the prevailing tendency to idolatry. Corruption was universal. (Ps. 14). As corruption was universal so was the punishment. The law was, the soul that sinneth it shall die. And so its expression in the type was universal. But beyond the type expressed by the universality of the Deluge came another idea, and that is of escape. This was symbolized by the ark. As to our first parents, there was mercy in the promise that the head of the serpent should be bruised by the seed of the woman, so to Noah, the second head of the race, came the type of salvation in the midst of destruction.

The conclusion therefore which seems to best agree with all the facts of the case, is that the Deluge was universal. The distribution of animals over the earth's surface, the difficulty of gathering them across seas and returning them to their former *habitat* without leaving a trace of their origin presents a difficulty which we know of no way of overcoming. But over against that is the destruction of a class of animals represented especially by the Mastodon which were evidently destroyed, not by glacial cold as were many of the huge carnivorous beasts, nor apparently by later cataclasms before man was created, but to a later period, which is represented by the Noachian Deluge.

It remains to look briefly at the sin, the punishment, and the escape.

THE SIN OF THE ANTEDILUVIANS

The sin which is specially mentioned is that against the marriage relation. Not that there were not other sins, as for example, idolatry, which we know from other sources was conspicuously prevalent. But this is singled out as a sin against the foundations of society, which this book is specially concerned in upholding. Marriage between one man and one woman was the primal order, as God first instituted it. Any deviation from that rule always brought disaster in the household, and its widespread violation would weaken the family tie, let loose violence and

passion, and introduce savagery and barbarism even more quickly and directly than idolatry. Two particulars of this sin of the Antediluvians are mentioned: First, Polygamy. They took them wives, it is said, of all that they chose (6:2). The primal order seems to have been the custom until the time of Lamech, the seventh from Adam in the line of Cain. He had two wives. In the line of Seth, we do not know that there was any departure from the original law, until this period. Second, The ground of their choice was not any consideration of what such marriages might lead to, or whether it was right in the sight of God or no, but simply that they were fair. At first the result seemed favorable. Their children were mighty men—men of renown. In what way their might was shown, we are not informed. But success does not prove we are right. In fact while they were glorying in their strength God was grieved over their wickedness. The strong language is used that it repented the Lord that he had made man on the earth (6:6). Such language is used from the standpoint of human observation and experience. The result had not been what might justly have been expected. All flesh had corrupted its way. The creation of the highest being on earth and placing him as Lord over other creatures seemed to be a failure. He was not carrying out the purpose of a being made in God's image, which would be to keep the animal, the material part of his nature subject to

the spiritual. Of course in the great and glorious plan to be unfolded in the ages, it was no failure, but for the present it looked so. The so-called Sons of God were one in transgression with the others, and hence the determination—in which divine repentance agrees with the human—to annul the past and commence anew.

The punishment sent was not without warning. There are two interpretations of the phrase, "Yet shall his days be a hundred and twenty years" (6:3). One would refer it to the shortening of man's life, which took place after the Flood. And the other that the warning of the coming Flood was given one hundred and twenty years before it actually took place. Some would say that Noah was engaged for that time in building the ark, and that thus he was a preacher of righteousness both by his words and deeds.

ARK

The great thought of mercy was specially represented by the Ark. From this time forward it stands out as a type of salvation from universal and overwhelming destruction. It is implied that others beside Noah might have availed themselves of this refuge had they been so inclined. But while Noah was making preparation others of his generation continued as before, marrying and giving in marriage, until the day he entered into the Ark (Matt. 24:31).

CLEAN AND UNCLEAN ANIMALS

One specification about clean and unclean animals may look as though there was an anticipation of what took place under the Mosaic Dispensation. But the institution of sacrifice necessarily drew the line between those proper for that service, and those that were not. How far this distinction went, we cannot say. But it was probably very much enlarged upon in the Levitical law.

As a type of divine mercy, the Ark suggests these thoughts: 1. It was salvation from punishment, and that punishment meant destruction. 2. This salvation was safe and complete. It meant more than sacrifice, which pointed out a way of approach to God. This, that there was a new world for the saved. 3. That the method, so far as Noah was concerned, was the same as that by which men have been saved through the ages; and that was by *faith*. 4. As the heir of the righteousness which is by faith, Noah was made the second head of the human family and a covenant made with him that God would no more destroy the earth by water. The sign of the covenant was the bow in the cloud, whether now for the first time visible, or something already existing which was made the sign, we can hardly say. 5. That the type was imperfect, as all types are, and so we have the record of Noah's falling into sin. (See Fairbank's "Typology of Scripture," Vol. 1, p. 272).

MESSIANIC PROPHECY

The sin of Noah was made the occasion of the second prophecy respecting the Messiah. The promise according to the arrangement of the Hebrew, is that God shall enlarge Japheth and shall dwell in the tents of Shem. According to this view, God is the subject of both verbs. Another interpretation is that Japheth shall dwell in the tents of Shem, which however apparently true in these latter days, when European nations are occupying Asia, does not seem to be the reference here. Enlargement to Japheth is true, but the great Messianic promise is to Shem. The victory over the serpent is to come, not merely through the seed of the woman, but through God's dwelling in the tents of Shem. What that dwelling was to be and how he should come in the flesh is left for later prophecies. Of the three sons of Noah, Shem is pointed out as in the line of promise.

CHAPTER VIII

THE ETHNOLOGICAL RECORD AND CONFUSION OF TONGUES

GENESIS, CHAP. 10 AND 11: 1-10

The two facts stated in this chapter, viz., the ethnological record and the confusion of tongues, are necessarily preliminary and commend themselves to the ordinary judgment, as the best and most truthful historical statement that could be given of the interval between the Deluge and the calling of Abraham. It is somewhat of a surprise that the attempt should be made to throw suspicion on the truthfulness of this record; but it seems to follow as a result from denying the authenticity of the previous chapters. When it has been granted that the creation of man reaches back thousands of years before the Biblical record—that there were different race-centers instead of mankind being descended from a single pair, and that the Deluge was local instead of universal, then we can also believe that the descendants of Noah were imaginary persons and the confusion of tongues a fundamental race distinction instead of the confusion of one common tongue. If, however, we hold to the view that the previous chapters are correct, then this record of the nations is eminently satisfactory, for it gives (1) The great divisions of the human family as they are recognized today—the sons of

Shem occupying Asia, Japheth Europe, and Ham Africa. The exceptions which occur in this distribution are pointed out with sufficient accuracy and agree with the narrative of subsequent events. The prominent exceptions occur among the earlier descendants of Ham—Canaan occupied Palestine, until they were dispossessed by the Children of Israel. Nimrod also, the founder of the Babylonian Empire, the conqueror of Assyria and the builder of Ninevah was the Son of Cush (10:8-12). And yet into that same region went the Children of Eber, a descendant of Shem (v. 21.) (2) Though many names cannot now be recognized, yet many of them agree with lands and places which have become familiar in historical periods—as Cush for Ethiopia, Mizraim for Egypt, Canaan for the primitive people of Palestine.

(3) Babylon, both by Scripture and according to human record, is the first city which was built after the Flood—or was it rebuilt? It is certain that the disposition to centralize there was obnoxious to the divine plan. Why, is not clear. If it was to escape another Flood, when God had assured Noah that it would not take place, it would seem as though they would have built a tower on a mountain instead of a plain. Could it have been in any way an act of defiance in rebuilding cities which had been prominent and well-known before the Flood, and perhaps noted for their wickedness? If this supposition is tenable that the at-

tempt was to rebuild Babylon, rather than first found it, we can easily account for a chronology on the part of the Assyrian Babylonian Empire which goes back to 5000 B. C.

(2). THE BUILDING OF BABEL AND THE CON-
FUSION OF TONGUES
(Genesis 11: 1-10.)

This is the last of the series of great historical facts recorded in the first part of Genesis. They are facts in the province of nature which concern all nations and all parts of the globe. It is evident that sin was not held in check by the terrible punishment of the Deluge; much less was it eliminated from man's thought and action. As the race began to multiply, they repeated over again the evil of their ancestors. It was the spirit of self-reliance instead of seeking for divine wisdom and guidance. It has been called the birth of *heathenism*, if indeed its birth should not be traced back to Cain and his descendants. Nimrod the strong, the mighty hunter, is their leader and representative. Their thought is expressed in their saying, "Let us make a *name*." The word translated name is the same with Shem—who as the holder of the special Messianic promise, it is thought, did not share in the scheme for the centralization of the race in the plain of Shinar.

(3) SPEECH

The method adopted for stopping their ambi-

tious scheme was very different from the overwhelming destruction of the Flood. How the confusion of speech came we can hardly tell. Speech, in the first place, we suppose to have been a gift of God. There was first the gift of thought and reason, and then the power of expression or the gift of speech. As Trench says, "God did not teach man words, as one of us teaches a parrot, but gave him the capacity and then evoked the capacity which he gave." ("Study of Words," p. 15, quoted by Drummond in "Ascent of Man," p. 178).

The latter writer, with other Evolutionists believes in the gradual development of the vocal organs, through different embryonic stages, from the lower animals, until the power of speech was reached. On the other hand, our view of the Biblical statement is that the perfect man, made in the image of God, had the power of expression given, as well as reason and capacity of thought. This power of expression, tested by man's naming the animals, was undoubtedly developed and added to, as experience demanded. This became the one language of earth before the Flood, and after, until the building of Babel. What that language was, whether wholly lost, or one of the three great family stock of languages, the record does not determine. It is something that the thousand different languages now existing on the earth can be reduced to three groups—the Semitic, the Aryan and the Turanian. Taylor Lewis likens

the relationship of these three to the geological formation of the rocks—the Semitic representing the primitive formation—the Aryan the stratified formation, broken yet presenting much clearness of outline and direction, while the Turanian is more like confused volcanic masses or solitary boulders scattered here and there, yet showing marks of the localities from whence they came, or some correspondence in the very irregularities of their fracture.” (In Lange’s “Genesis,” p. 373). As an example of this latter class might be mentioned the language of the Hottentots or Bushmen of South Africa, which is described as consisting of “deep aspirated gutturals, other harsh consonants, and a multitude of ugly inimitable clicks.” (See “Missionary Herald” for 1850, p. 173).

This general relationship of different languages has not little weight in proving the *unity* of the race. Races which have been thought to be too antagonistic to be related, have been found to be near of kin. Thus through the Sanscrit, the ancient and dead language of the Hindoo, it has been found that we and they belong to the same group, the Indo-European. This seems more remarkable when it is remembered that between these people of kindred languages, there is interspersed a dividing sea of Semitic languages and peoples represented by the ancient Syriac, Hebrew and Arabic with their cognate languages. In language the Hindoo is a nearer brother to

the Anglo-Saxon than either is to the Arabs or Jews. (See Taylor Lewis in Lange's "Genesis," p. 379).

Another connecting link is with the Malays and the Polynesian group of Islands. For the purpose of ascertaining this connection, Wm. Von Humboldt investigated the Kawi—a language of Java, and found that it could be traced back to the Sanscrit as its root and source. There are remains of temples in Java which owe their origin to India, but in the language legends and customs of the people, there is a connecting influence dating further back. (See "Princeton Review," 1852, pp. 290 and 427).

To this may be added the testimony of Dr. Codrington who has made vocabularies of forty of the Mulanesian languages, and says that they are not only homogeneous, but a branch of one great family, including the Malayan and Polynesian. Judge Fernander, for over thirty years a resident in the Hawaiian Islands, published a volume (Furbush & Co., London, 1885) giving a comparative vocabulary of the Polynesian and Indo-European languages. If these views are correct, an affinity is established with the Sanscrit for all those diverse and isolated regions extending from Madagascar to within forty degrees of the west coast of South America. The conclusion of Prof. W. D. Whitney, who is known as one of the most cautious of philologists, is perhaps as far as we can go, with our present

knowledge. While he would disclaim for linguistic science the power to prove that the human race in the beginning formed one Society, yet he says, "it is even far more demonstrable, that it can never prove the variety of human races and origins." ("Life and Growth of Language," p. 269).

In the breaking up the concentration of the race, on the plains of Shinar, we have one of those divine acts which show the varied control which God exercises over the nations. Men go on in their own methods for a time, developing arts and industry and, it may be, plunging into sin, thinking God has no control over human affairs, and then like an earthquake, comes a new force, showing that God governs, and that his plans must be carried out. This was the way at the Flood. More quiet, yet equally effectual, was the confounding of human speech. Still more noiseless and yet even more important was the calling of Abraham.

In confounding the speech of men, the thought of God was not merely to stop the town-builders, but to scatter the Sons of Noah to people the earth. As far as a great structure was concerned, Babel was eclipsed not long after, if not in extent, certainly in durability, by the great Pyramid. This covered thirteen and one-half acres, and was 480 feet in perpendicular height. Some give the date of its erection as about 4000 B. C. A more conservative estimate is 2190 B. C. (See Piazzzi Smith's book on the "Great Pyramid.") This

latter date corresponds to the time between the confusion of languages and the call of Abraham. Other great buildings and temples followed soon after, both in Babylon and Egypt, showing that man was not, in those early days, lacking in architectural skill. And the unearthing of libraries with their clay tablets, has shown the great progress in literature, even in the more recondite labor of forming codes of laws. These indications in the way of buildings and literature, show that the benumbing and demoralizing tendency of heathenism had not yet very largely affected the race. After the confusion of tongues and the consequent separation and hostility of tribes, there would be a settling down into barbarism in many lands. The process is one that has been repeating itself—so that the homes of the greatest civilization have become the lair of wild beasts; and the scattered inhabitants are only able to build hovels out of the ruins of the palaces, where their fathers dwelt. Progress there has been with the race, especially since the purpose of God began it, in Abraham and afterwards in Christ, but it has kept to no country or people, while other cults look to the past for the days of their glory.

PART II

THE BEGINNING OF THINGS IN GRACE

FIRST. WITH THE INDIVIDUAL

SECOND. WITH THE FAMILY

THIRD. WITH THE NATION

CHAPTER IX

GRACE WITH RESPECT TO THE INDIVIDUAL—THE CALLING OF ABRAHAM ON THE DIVINE SIDE

GENESIS 12.

Nothing is more obvious, even to the ordinary reader of the Bible, than that at the calling of Abraham, we open a new chapter in the record of God's dealings with man. The eleven chapters of Genesis before we reach his time are brief. There is a short account of the two thousand and more years in which we have the story of Creation, the Fall, the Deluge, and the Confusion of Tongues. And then a verse or two gives the biography of those men who lived so long, Adam and Noah, those two fathers of our race, and living each nearly a thousand years, have but brief mention. But when we come to Abraham, who is in one sense our spiritual head, it is entirely different. When we ask the reason for this, it is not far to seek. It is not the length of his days, for he lived but a few years, as compared with his fathers. It is not that he was a great warrior, or a great builder like Nimrod. Many migrations went out from the valley of the Euphrates, but this of Abraham's is the only one that attracts the inspired historian. It was simply that he was called of God and responded to that call. It was but right and natural that man

made in the image of God, should seek his fellowship and presence. But this he failed to do. The independent will, which was a part of the image of God, showed its alienation as soon as he had fallen by hiding from him. And though there was a promise of restoration and victory, the first born of Adam was a murderer. As men multiplied they all went astray. Even the severe judgment of wiping out the race, with the exception of one family and the shortening their days, did not restrain wickedness or lead men to seek after God. And so, after the long trial and waiting to see if any would seek him, God reverses the process and begins the search after man. This is Revelation beginning in the call of Abraham, passing on to the training of a peculiar people, the coming of the God-man who is the restorer of the divine image and the head of a spiritual race as Adam was of the earthly natural race. This new race is typified and represented by Abraham the father of the faithful, to whom came the promise, and whose faith was accounted for righteousness, and in Jacob who though weak as a man, was through grace a prince with God, and in Joseph, whose exaltation in Egypt foreshadowed the triumph of the new vital principle over the powers of darkness.

(1) INSUFFICIENCY OF NATURAL RELIGION

In God's calling of Abraham we see, first, the insufficiency of natural religion or of any process

of evolution by which man through his own strength and wisdom can reach a clear and correct view of God. Much less can he hope for salvation through any effort of his own. God alone can say whether man is to be saved, and if so, how. As far as we can interpret God's plans, man seems to have been left after the Fall to his own desires, to see if he would seek after God. Instead of that, they all went astray. If we seek for the reason, why men who built Babylon and Nippur and who had the civilization and literature found in their ruins, and who also had such exceptional representatives of the true faith as Melchisedek and the patriarch Job, how they could turn aside to idolatry, we can only find the reason in the moral obliquity of the race. As Adam hid in the garden from God, so his descendants did not like to retain in their minds the knowledge of God. (Rom. 1). At first men seem to have deified even Aurora and the powers of nature as fire, but these did not rebuke sin any more than Baal and Astarti or the four-footed beasts, which they substituted in place of the true God. The downward tendency towards gross idolatry, superstition and savagery is plain and manifest the world over. Partly civilized peoples look back to a higher condition and to renowned sages whom they never expect to equal. The Egyptians of today could not build the Pyramids. The Chinamen of this century would not think of equalling Confucius and Mencius. The stupid

priests of Buddha walk among shrines and temples erected by the active missionaries of their faith, who had an eye to beauty and a zeal and ability in propagating their system which has long since died out. The thought that has saved the world from the grossest heathenism, was in the divine mind, and first began to be carried out in the call of Abraham.

(2) THE MESSIANIC PROMISE

This calling was to the reception of the Messianic promise, that in him, that is, in Abraham, should all the families of the earth be blessed (12:3). Coupled with that was the promise to make of him, a great nation. Here was a great advance upon the promise to our first parents. That spoke of victory over the serpent, but here in addition, was a blessing to all the families of the earth. In one sense it was restricted to Abraham and his seed, but only for the sake of a great blessing to all the families of the earth. It was the beginning of the gospel of glad tidings, God had done good in providing a home for man and in giving him the blessings of his Providence, but he had been obliged to punish man for his transgression. Now he would reveal attributes of love and mercy, as they had never been revealed before.

(3) COVENANT OF CIRCUMCISION

In order to make this promise more binding God made a covenant by which he as the main

part, agreed to do certain things to Abraham, who, on his part, was to signify his acceptance by receiving the sign and seal of the covenant. This seal of circumcision has been a witness through the ages of God's call to Abraham, and the promise made that his seed should be God's people. The seal of the covenant had this significance, that as man created in the divine image should have dominion over the animal within, as well as the animals without—so in circumcision the flesh with its appetites and passions should be held in check.

(4) PROVIDENTIAL GUIDANCE

This covenant on the part of God insured Providential guidance, instruction and discipline. A large portion of the narrative is taken up with the details of this guidance. It was both present care and provision for the future. A brief summary is all that can be attempted. It included (1) all the ordinary acts and duties of life, as well as those which we would call more spiritual and religious. Hagar's eyes were opened to behold a well of water for the relief of herself and son. Abraham's servant was guided in the selection of a wife for his master's son. Jacob's selfish life was beaten out of him, not only by visions of angels, but by a long course of discipline with his still more selfish uncle. Joseph was exalted to be ruler of Egypt and saviour of his people, not by one sudden step from the shepherd's staff

to the royal purple, but through slavery, severe temptation, prison and neglect, until his spirit was chastened into strong dependence on God. And then how important towards the ultimate end, were minute and apparently unimportant details, such as the sending of the Ishmaelites at the right juncture, in turning the purpose of Joseph's brethren and taking him to Egypt. Then the treacherous memory of the chief-butler and the recalling of his obligation after two years had passed, shows how all things, even the hidden workings of the human mind, are under the divine control. And yet (2) this control or guidance, does not interfere with the free agency of the human actors. The brethren of Joseph, for example, thought they were accomplishing their purpose. They did their wicked act, told their lie to their father, felt the remorse, which naturally followed their cruelty and deceit. And still out of their evil doings God brought about the good result of saving much people alive. (3) Though this guidance was not limited to occasions when it was sought or asked for, yet it was often given in answer to prayer. Providence means seeing before and a perfect readiness to meet all emergencies in advance as well as after they have arisen. This anticipatory part of the great scheme helps us in understanding that petition and answers to petition, are parts of a foreordained plan and purpose, which God is carrying out in the history of individuals and nations. He

wants his people to come into fellowship with him, to ask and receive. He protects from harm, as when Laban pursued after Jacob, but in the great crisis of his life, when a brother's wrath was to be appeased, there was the wrestling, the urgent entreaty, and the direct answer to his request. Thus prayer was honored—the supplanter became a prince with God, and the scheme of Providence included an apparent contradiction, in yielding to the wants and supplications of the human. (4) Another fact needs to be noticed about this guidance, and that is, it was marked and peculiar towards the people of God. It is said in the Psalms “He suffered no man to do them wrong; yea, he reproveth kings for their sakes” (105: 14). Abimelech and his friends who came to Isaac at Beersheba said, “We saw certainly that the Lord was with thee,” and therefore they wished to make an oath and covenant, because “thou art now blessed of the Lord” (Gen. 26: 28). This special favor is made very plain in the narrative. A distinction is made even between Laban and Jacob—the latter receiving more largely of the gifts of Providence—so that he increased exceedingly and had much cattle and maid-servants and men-servants and camels and asses” (30: 43). The same fact was exemplified in the brothers Jacob and Esau, where the distinction between the two—the one the child of promise and the other not—is so great, that it is said, “Jacob have I loved, and Esau have I

hated." The whole record carries this impression that it was written for the sake of the covenant people. All the others are mentioned incidentally, and as their history is interwoven with that of Israel. When Egypt was blessed and the famine was in other lands, the pivot around which these events revolved was the bringing Jacob and his sons into Egypt and saving them alive.

The discrimination thus shown, was not because of the intrinsic goodness of the parties so chosen. Jacob, for example, was rightly called a supplanter. He readily joined in the deceit to rob his brother of his father's blessing. And though strictly honest in his dealings with Laban, he looked out sharply for his own interests. And yet upon him was conferred the blessings of the covenant. His sons also, with the exception of Joseph, were anything but exemplary young men. Envy, murder, lust and revenge were in the list of their crimes. These things are clearly and frankly recorded, that we may see that it is by grace we are saved, and not by our own good works; and also that we as sinners may be encouraged to trust in the covenant and promise of God. This fact remains clear and unmistakable that God in his Providential guidance, has special care for his people. They are the children, for whom he builds the house, to whom he gives the education, and who are to receive the inheritance. This lesson taught to the Patriarchs runs through the whole Bible. The church is the bride, the chosen

people, the seed corn, through whom the families of the earth are to be blessed. The practical lesson is not to find fault with this guidance, because it is special in its kindness, care and gifts, but so to place ourselves in covenant relation to God that we shall be sharers in his bounty. God's special love was in this beginning of the gospel, confined to a single individual and then to his family and seed. But it was that the families of the earth might be blessed in him. The outflow of love is to all—Jew and Gentile—to the spiritual not to the natural seed of Abraham. If we listen to the call of God, we can be heirs of the promise.

(5) Another thought in connection with this care and guidance on the part of God, was the clearer light thrown upon the meaning of *sacrifice*. At the very first, it was made plain that sacrifice was not a mere thank-offering, but one of the firstlings of the flock, where in some way not revealed, life must go for life. Fuller teachings seem to have been purposely reserved until the occasion had arisen. This was furnished by the command of God to Abraham to take his only son Isaac to offer him upon the mountain, afterwards to be used as a site for temple offerings. Isaac as the promised seed, and so representing the Jewish race, or more generally the spiritual seed of Abraham, was laid upon the altar, showing that he deserved to die, and that he was only saved by the substitution of a victim appointed in his place.

The position of man therefore, as represented by Isaac, was that of condemnation—deserving death, and only saved by a substitute. Whether a lamb could take this place or not, or whether it was a type of another and better victim, was not so clear. It was for the time, the appointed substitute and they had to wait to understand what the type signified—whether a lamb, or some one who could more adequately take our place. While we see the mercy, which Abraham saw in providing a lamb instead of his son, we are to look further and see mercy meeting justice, assenting to its claims, fulfilling all the demands of the law and yet rescuing the guilty. It is a substitution of the Creator for the creature, of the holy for the sinful, of the Son of God—the Isaac of the father's heart—for man, deserving wrath and condemnation.

CHAPTER X

CALLING OF ABRAHAM FROM THE HUMAN SIDE

So far we have been looking at the call of Abraham from the divine side. We need to see the response in the human heart. Before looking, however, at those spiritual characteristics, which reveal to us the excellency of Abraham as the father of the faithful, there are personal features which show us the man as he lived in his tents in those olden times. Stanley in his "History of the Jewish Church" (Sect. 1, p. 12), says the migration of Abraham from Mesopotamia differed but little in its external aspects from a Bedouin chief in modern times, starting with his family, his droves and his servants on some journey to a distant land. "There are their flocks of sheep and goats, and the asses moving underneath the towering forms of the camels. The chief is there amidst the stir of movement, or resting at noon within his black tent, marked out from the rest, by his cloak of brilliant scarlet, by the fillet of rope which binds the loose handkerchief round his head, by the spear which he holds in his hand to guide the march and fix the encampment. The chief's wife, the princess of the tribe, is there in her own tent, to make the cakes and prepare the usual meal of milk and butter, the slave or the child is ready to bring in the red lentil soup for

the weary hunter, or to kill the calf for the unexpected guest.

We cannot but admire the wisdom that thus chose Abraham, engaged as he was in the ordinary occupations of life. He was to exemplify the graces of faith and obedience as he went about his daily duties. If he had been called to be a recluse, others would have said he does not have to fight our battles. He is alone and does not understand our surroundings and temptations. What the world wanted was the example of one of their own numbers living their life of faith when surrounded by the present; and an obedience to the unseen, event when the seen was demanding our constant care and attention.

Abraham was the tenth generation from Noah and born two years after his death. His father's name was Terah, a descendant of Shem. He was born in Ur of the Chaldees, B. C. 1996. Ur is generally supposed to be the ancient Nippur, formerly on the shores of the Persian Gulf, though now a hundred miles inland. At the time of Abraham's call, this city was a maritime emporium, a walled town, with a high civilization and large commerce, situated in a rich country, said to be the original home of the wheat plant and famous for its dates and other fruits. It was also the holy city of the Chaldeans. The temple located there has recently been explored, showing the polytheistic character of this early home of Abraham, and also a high degree of

literary attainment and activity, as witnessed especially in the code of Hammurami. The Polytheistic tendency of the times is referred to by Joshua in calling upon the people to put away the gods which your fathers served on the other side of the flood (or, as Kent translates, "beyond the River"). The first step in Abraham's journey was to Haran, where he remained about five years, and where his father Terah died. Haran is represented as a large commercial city five hundred miles to the northeast of Ur, and where Sayce says a native of that place would have found himself more at home than in any other city of the world. Here Abraham's brother Nahor remained and Jacob, the grandson of Abraham went thither for his wife. (See Peloubet's Notes for 1901, and Geikie's "Hours with the Bible").

At Haran came the first intimation to Abraham of his destination. The "not knowing whither he went" (Heb. 11:8), seems to refer especially to the period before the departure from Haran. In this second stage, he took Sarai his wife, and Lot his brother's son, and all their substance that they had gathered, and the souls they had gotten in Haran (12:5) and departed for Canaan, probably by the way Damascus. From thence they journeyed south through the land to Bethel, where he builded an altar unto the Lord (v. 8). Here in about the center of the promised inheritance, the Lord appeared unto him and said, "Unto thy seed will I give this land" (12:7).

As we pass on to the main features of Abraham's character, all must note the fact made clear in both Testaments, that faith and its resultant fruits, is the grace made prominent in his life. "Abraham believed God and it was counted unto him for righteousness." (Gen. 15:6; Rom. 4:3). It belongs to the symmetry of gospel development that a grace so fundamental should show itself as the first in order historically. And this faith unfolded in the history is the counterpart of the same faith in individual believers. The first step was renunciation of idolatry and departure from the land of his fathers.

The most obvious proof of leaving off any sinful course of life, is to get up and go away from those who practice it. This is set forth by Bunyan in describing Christian as leaving the City of Destruction. And it often requires more than one warning to get fairly away from our surroundings. Haran is only half-way to Canaan, and many stop there. The effectual call to Abraham was when his destination was made known to him. How God appeared on these different occasions, we know not. It was probably in different ways, for once he came as a traveller. But his presence and personality and the words of promise were clear and distinct. And Abraham believed in and worshipped the Lord who appeared to him, according to the practice of the worthies who had gone before, building an altar wherever he pitched his tent. There must have been some-

thing of this true worship kept up by others, as probably by Shem and certainly by Melchizedek, but the tendency with the great majority was towards idolatry.

Special emphasis is given in Scripture, to Abraham's faith in the future. The promise was to his seed, and yet he waited, twenty-five years for a son. The land in which he dwelt as a stranger was to be his, and yet he had no possession in it but a burying-place. And then there was no history such as we have, to bolster up a weak faith against appearances. Noah alone believed God about a threatened destruction, and it came. Here was a promise of good, would it take place? His seed was to be as the sand of the sea, and he had no children.

Another evidence of faith was his obedience. This was always prompt at every indication of duty. If he was to take a long journey, he took his tent, gathered his flocks and his household and moved forward. When circumcision was appointed as the seal of the covenant, it is said "that in the self-same day he did as God said unto him" (17:23). And in the great trial of his faith, when told to offer up his only son Isaac, the command came apparently in a vision of the night, for it is said, he rose up early in the morning and at once undertook the prescribed duty, though so painful and trying to a father's heart.

And this obedience was not only prompt, but unquestioning. The test was severe. It was his

only son Isaac, whom he loved—the child of his old age and the child of promise. He was to take him and offer him up for a burnt-offering. It was not easy to still the doubts and questionings, which must have arisen in his mind, except as intimated in the Epistle to the Hebrews that he expected his son's resurrection (11:19). But whatever way God might adopt of vindicating himself, Abraham knew his duty was obedience; and resolutely undertook it, even to the uplifted knife, when God stayed his hand.

Over against this grace of obedience, was one which is, in some measure its opposite, that of *patient waiting*. They who are quick and prompt often find it difficult to wait. They wish to be up and doing. And so when anything desirable is long delayed, the hard thing is to wait, or to abstain from using some crooked device of our own, instead of accepting God's time and way. As a fact, Abraham failed in this particular more than in the others mentioned. In accordance with the custom of those times, and at the suggestion of Sarah, he took a concubine, who bore him Ishmael. Abraham seems to have expected that this son should have taken the place of the promised seed. It was not in this way, however, that God chose to carry out his plans. Marriage as first instituted was to be honored, and any departure therefrom, however excusable on account of prevailing custom and the incompleteness of Revelation, was not to be canctioned. And in this case,

concubinage yielded its usual fruits of jealousy and trouble in the household. In the waiting, however, God tested Abraham's faith no less than by prompt and willing obedience. Through those long years—a quarter of a century—it seemed as though the promise would fail. From a human point of view it seemed impossible—so absurd that Sarah laughed with derision, yet God was true to his promise, and trained Abraham to that important lesson of patient waiting on him alone, or of hoping against hope, simply because God said so.

The graces thus far considered are those which are specially exercised towards God. They could indeed have no existence, unless through an abiding sense of Jehovah's presence, supreme authority, and the assurance that he would do all that he had promised. Faith in God was the starting point, even before Abraham could have left his own country and his father's house. And the root of obedience, of patient waiting and of those kindly graces towards man was faith. He believed God, and therefore he did as bidden. He believed, and therefore he could wait. He believed in God, who was patient and forgiving towards him, and therefore he was kind and forgiving towards man. There is an apocryphal story repeated by Stanley that Abraham was taught the lesson of kindness to strangers by God himself. It is said that an old man of an hundred years, passed Abraham's tent, to whom he offered hos-

pitality. But when he gave him food and saw that he asked no blessing, and that when he lay down at night he prayed not to God, Abraham ordered him out of his door, because he would not worship. When he had gone, God met him and said, "Couldst not thou bear with a stranger for one night, with whom I have borne for an hundred years?" Abraham accordingly went after the man, brought him back to his tent, and treated him kindly. The story may not be true, but the truth hid under it is correct, that our best instruction in kindly graces towards man comes from God's dealings towards us. Perhaps we would not be justified in saying that the hospitality so religiously practised by the Arabs of the present day is the direct result of some such incident as specified in the story, but he who walks with God as Abraham did, as a friend, must feel the weight of his example as well as his direct commands. The best humanity is that which comes into closest contact with divinity.

It is well to notice other points in his treatment of others, which show a reflection of his friendship with God. One was his treatment of his nephew Lot. On account of the increase of their flocks, they found it necessary to separate. Instead of Abraham insisting on his own rights as the elder of the two, and the one to whom the promise of the land had been given, he gives to Lot the choice. And then when Lot and his neighbors were captured in a raid by the kings of the

East, instead of leaving him to the just consequences of his selfish mistake, Abraham shows both forgiveness and courage by going to the rescue; and in the only warlike expedition of his life, conquers chieftains or kings who had made this the business of their lives.* And with what unselfishness he restores goods as well as persons, instead of making them the prize of war, as was suggested by those whom he had rescued. (ch. 14).

The same high-minded delicacy characterized Abraham's dealings with the sons of Heth, when he bought the cave of Macpelah for a burying-place for Sarah his wife (ch. 22). How elevated in tone the whole transaction. These strangers—these dwellers in tents, had so impressed upon the owners of the soil their honorable dealings and methods of living, that they would take no advantage of them in a bargain, and treated Abraham as "a prince of God" among us. The fair and honorable man, begat, as was his due, the respect and kind treatment of his neighbors.

It is worthy of remark that Abraham did not seek to carry the body of Sarah back to the home

*"Chederlaomer is clearly an Elamite name (Kudur-Lagamar). Amraphel may well be the later form of the name of the famous Babylonian king Hammurabi who ultimately delivered his nation from the Elamite yoke. Ellasar is perhaps the Hebrew form of Larsa, one of the important towns of Southern Babylonia. The fact that the Elamites ruled Babylonia prior to 2200 B.C. and that these Eastern powers at times extended their authority to the Mediterranean is established by the testimony of the Babylonian inscriptions." (Kent's Beginnings of Hebrew History, p. 85.)

of his ancestors in Haran or Ur. This is a common feeling with those who have left the home of their fathers. Joseph desired that his father and that he himself should be buried in the land given them by God. Canaan was to Abraham and all his descendants the land of their inheritance, even when they owned only a burying-lot. But beyond the earthly Canaan there is every reason for the assertion of the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews that they looked for a City whose builder and maker is God (11:10). God appeared repeatedly to Abraham, and the only legitimate inference was that he had a habitation where he especially lived or manifested himself. To that home or city Abraham looked forward as a place where Enoch and the true Sons of God had gone.

These, then, are the graces which have made Abraham known and respected among all nations, Jew and Gentile. He was no warrior, no builder of cities, no philosopher or teacher, simply a plain man dwelling in tents. He was called of God, and became a friend of God. And so he has left an example of faith and obedience towards God and of kindness and unselfishness towards men which have been an encouragement and help in all ages.

CHAPTER XI

JACOB ON THE POSITION OF PRAYER IN THE INDIVIDUAL LIFE

Before proceeding with the life of Jacob, there are one or two general observations which ought to be made. (1) One is that these are not the biographies that would have attracted ordinary historians and poets. They would have written about Nimrod, the mighty hunter, the builder of Babylon, or Cheder-Laomer, king of Elam, or Tidal, king of nations (Gen. 14:11). But here is Abraham not even a king, only the chief of a tribe, who fought only one battle. And why was he selected? He was the called of God and responded by a willing faith and obedience. It was a life that took on the spiritual and eternal, a life that was important only as it took hold on God and yet a life that has helped revolutionize the world and give us new conceptions of a greatness greater than that of sword or world-wide fame. (2) We need more than one example of those who have walked by faith. Abraham is such a brilliant example of faith and obedience, and was so honorable in his dealings with men that he seems of better clay than ordinary mortals. That we be not discouraged we need another type like Jacob, the Supplanter.

As Abraham's character—his faith and obedience—illustrate a part of religious experience in

the individual, so another and very important part is illustrated by Jacob, and that is prayer. Not that Abraham and the other patriarchs were not men of prayer, but it stands out more prominently in the history of Jacob's life. The record about Isaac is comparatively brief. He was in a measure the completion of his father's life. Like him, he was a man of peace, following the same industries and having many of the same experiences. One incident with regard to the wife of Isaac shows a similar stage of civilization in Egypt and among the Philistines a generation apart (Gen. 12: 11, 20: 2 and 26: 7).

In the most important incident in the lives of father and son, they stood together. The father took the son to offer him as a sacrifice, but that son was no mere child, but a young man of twenty or twenty-five. (This is the opinion of Josephus.) At that age he would have had all the hopes and aspirations of an heir of his father's wealth, and of the divine promises. If the obedience of Abraham, ready to slay his son, illustrates the love of God the Father, who did not withhold his only Son, surely the acquiescence of Isaac in the stern command, shadows forth the submission of Christ, in laying down his life of his own will, for the salvation of a lost world.

The relation between Abraham and Jacob is best seen by the phraseology, which is used after this in speaking of the history of God's chosen people. They are sometimes called children of

Abraham. Especially is this applied to his spiritual children, inasmuch as they exhibited his faith. At other times they are called children of Israel. Isaac is not mentioned except when the three patriarchs are spoken of together. The truth taught seems to be this, that in the prayer of the one and in the faith and obedience of the other, we have the fundamental and indissoluble parts of all religious experience.

Paul was a man of great faith and unswerving obedience or loyalty to the Lord Jesus; yet of the transition period of his life it is said, "Behold he prayeth." Prayer does not belong to the natural man, however much he may practise its forms. Prayer was not natural to Jacob, though by natural descent a son of Abraham. His disposition was to trust in himself, and seek to carry out his plans by circumventing or supplanting others. How he was cured of this tendency, and his character as well as his name changed from Jacob to Israel is unfolded in the history.

The difference between Jacob and his twin brother Esau was marked from their birth. Twins often resemble one another, but here the divergence was manifest not only physically, but in their dispositions. Esau did not care for the quiet pastoral life of caring for flocks, but preferred roving about as a hunter. Jacob, whose homelike tastes, pleased his mother, had also an over-reaching disposition. This was manifest in the bargain, which he made with his brother for

his birthright. There is this redeeming feature on the part of Jacob, in this transaction. He saw and in a measure appreciated the excellence of the promise made to Abraham and repeated to Isaac. And we need to bear in mind that Abraham lived until his grandsons, Esau and Jacob, were fifteen years old. And the same disposition, for which he was commended by Jehovah, "that he will command his children and his household after him" (Gen 18:19), doubtless characterized him, in impressing the lessons of his life upon those who were to be the inheritors of the promises made to him. Esau with all this knowledge and with the position of first-born, despised his birthright. For the sake of satisfying his hunger, he forfeited all for which his grandfather had left his native land, and for which he had waited for years. If Esau thus lived for the present, and was careless of and despised future good, we certainly cannot justify Jacob, who was mean enough to take such an advantage, and bargain away his dish of lentils, which he ought to have given, for what he knew would be a valuable possession.

But if in this case, Jacob's conduct was that of a supplanter, sharp and over-reaching for his own benefit, the next transaction in which he appears, was still worse. It was a clear case of deception and unblushing falsehood—suggested, it is true, by his mother, but readily fallen in with and adopted by the son. Isaac was old and blind

and confined to his bed, and thought he would soon die—though he actually lived forty-three or sixty-three* years after this, dying at the age of one hundred and eighty. It is probable that he recovered in a great measure from his sickness, and was able to be about again. With his strong ideas of the right of the first-born, Isaac called Esau, that he might give him his fatherly blessing before he died. Rebekah hears the conversation, and perhaps excusing herself on account of the character of Esau, and his marriage with the daughters of the land, and remembering also the divine word that the elder should serve the younger (25:23), called her son Jacob, to co-operate with her in securing the blessing for himself. Jacob was now fifty-seven or seventy-seven, according as we reckon the number of years spent in Mesopotamia), and so, of course, no mere child. The mother's appeal was to his self-interest. And his grasping, covetous nature acquiesced in the plan of deception, which he carried

* The usual calculation is that Isaac was now 137. Joseph having been introduced to Pharoah in his thirtieth year (ch. 41:40) and having been 39 (ch. 45:6) when his father aged 133 (ch. 47:9) came into Egypt, must have been born before Jacob was 91; consequently as his birth occurred in the 14th year of Jacob's sojourn in Mesopotamia (cf. ch. 30:25 with 29:18, 21, 22) Jacob's flight must have taken place when he was 77. But Jacob was born in Isaac's 60th year (25:26) hence Isaac was now 137. There are however, difficulties connected with this reckoning. It takes for granted that Jacob was in Padan Aram only 20 years, whereas Kennicott thinks it 40, 14 for his wives, 20 of after service and 6 for wages. According to the latter Isaac at this time was 117 (Pulpit Commentary in loco).

out not only by putting on Esau's garments and covering his hands and the smooth of his neck with goat-skins, but boldly silenced his father's doubts by one falsehood after another.

When the deception was discovered, as necessarily it would be as soon as Esau returned, the latter determines to retaliate and kill his brother as soon as the death of his father should take place. The mother, aware of his intention, sends Jacob away to Padan Aram to her brother.

BETHEL, CH. 28

And here comes in that wondrous grace on the part of God, which gives this refugee from revenge, the hope that the blessing of Abraham rested upon him, more surely than the words of Isaac. Very indefinite and intangible was the birthright, unless he had the assurance that Abraham's God was his God. He had been trying by subterfuge and deception to obtain the blessing. The vision as he slept on the stone at Bethel, was that that was not the way, but to seek it from God himself. Jacob's way was like Paul's going about to establish his own righteousness, but the vision of the one at midnight and the other at mid-day, was that Jehovah and the angelic host is our only defence. How puny and useless the efforts of man by the side of the open heavens. This is the thought that man needs to realize, before he takes Jehovah to be his God. It was a personal revelation to Jacob and Paul.

And in one sense it is a personal revelation to every man before he gets into the light. It is God finding us, instead of our getting the blessing by our own struggle.* And that opens heaven and makes our heart a temple, where the angels ascend and descend. This vision of heaven brought near, found its highest realization in Christ Jesus, taking our nature and making a complete and perfect ladder by which heaven lifts earth into light and life. It is salvation for *sinful* man.

As to Jacob himself he had the blessing of Abraham confirmed and the promise added of personal care in all places where he should go; and that he should be brought again to the land promised to him and to his seed. One thought would be that after this, Jacob would be a new man, that the light of that vision and the encouragement of those promises, would have lifted him out of his former self. But in a measure he is Jacob still. He had to deal with one disposed to take all possible advantage in every transaction. Laban deceived him about his wife, and changed his wages ten times. Jacob yielded to the deception about Leah, as if sent by the Lord as a reminder of his own fault. It looks also as though he secured an extra share of cattle by one of his old subter-

* There is the waiting for the action of our own will, as in the case of the Prodigal Son, when he came to himself—and there is the divine calling and stimulus to right action. They are both true and it is not necessary here to attempt the reconciliation.

fuges. But then again he went even further than strict justice in bearing the loss of that which was stolen or torn by beasts (31:39). Further than this there was a constant recognition of God's hand, which was so manifest that Laban said, "I have learned by experience that the Lord hath blessed me, for thy sake" (30:27). We know that Jacob made a vow to give a tenth to God, of all that God should give him" (28:22). There is no record of the way in which the vow was carried out. But as it became a law among his descendants, we suppose that he adhered to it. And there is nothing like a conscientious adherence to the principle of giving a proportion to the Lord, that takes the selfishness so completely out of a man.

An equally potent factor in subduing selfishness is generosity. And Jacob was ready now to do a generous act, as he had been before to do a mean one. It is true that he proposed by the present which he prepared for his brother to appease his anger (32:20). But when this had been done in answer to prayer, he still urges the acceptance of the present. And it was no insignificant gift that he offered. "Two hundred she goats and twenty he goats, thirty milch camels with their colts, forty kine and ten bulls, twenty she asses and ten foals" (32:14 and 15). It was astonishing that he who went out with only his staff, twenty or even forty years before, could give so freely and have anything left. But the

Lord had evidently been with him, and this present said in speech stronger than words, I was a supplanter, I wrongly obtained the birthright. I sinned in deceiving my father. But here is the best reparation I can make. I obtained nothing by my deception. But the Lord has blessed me. Accept this and let us be brothers.

PENUEL, 32

But whatever gifts might do, Jacob had learned not to depend on them, or upon any efforts of his own. In accordance with the command of God, he had gathered his family together and started on his return journey. The first difficulty was in getting away from Laban, his father-in-law. Laban seemed to regard the large family and numerous herds as in a measure belonging to him as the chief of the tribe, and so to avoid strife or even angry words, Jacob stole away. Laban followed and overtook him after a seven days' pursuit, in Mount Gilead (31:23). Here God appeared to Laban, warning him not to enter upon any discussion. After they had agreed that neither should pass that boundary line with the intention of injuring one another, Jacob went on his way and was still further encouraged by a vision of two hosts of angels (32:2) as if one would keep from dangers in the rear and the other from those in advance. And yet when the messengers whom he had sent forward to learn the situation, returned with the word that Esau was

coming to meet him with four hundred men, he was greatly afraid and distressed: 32:7.) While Jacob had been following the arts of peace, his brother had become a military chieftain—a shiekh of the desert, who would consider this roving unprotected band, a lawful and easy prey for one of their raids. And then there came the remembrance of that vow of vengeance for his deceit. Here was an easy chance to execute it. Might would soon show to whom belonged the birthright. If Jacob had tried to flee where could he go? He had just fled from Mesopotamia and was under obligation not to return. If he should try, he could not escape from his brother. Will Esau kill him as he had threatened to do? And with four hundred men he had the power. Certainly his only hope was in God. And so in deep humility and with absolute dependence on God, he prays “I am not worthy, of the least of all the mercies and of all the truth, which Thou showed unto Thy servant.” (32:10). God had been true and merciful to him and he had not been true to God. He had trusted to his own devices and not to the promise. And the trouble which threatened was purely the result of his own deceit. If God helped, it would be by treating him not as he deserved. And upon the mercy of God he dared to trust, because of the promises, and the command of God to return. The promise made to Abraham and renewed to Isaac, had also been made his when God appeared to him at Bethel. And the command had come

to him, to "return unto thy country and to thy kindred and I will deal well with thee." (32: cf 31:13). He was therefore in the path of duty. Thus called of God to return, he could plead the promises and say, how are these to be fulfilled, if Esau should come and smite me and the mother with the children. Knowing the difficulties and knowing also how God had removed these difficulties in the case of others, he prays "O God of my father Abraham and God of my father Isaac, deliver me I pray thee from the hand of my brother." The intensity of this desire is represented to us more vividly, by the wrestling of a man with Jacob until the breaking of the day (v. 24). As this man is afterwards spoken of as God (v. 30) it seems not unreasonable to think of him as our Divine Intercessor, who can easily overcome us by a touch and yet graciously condescends to our infirmities, hears our prayer and allows us to prevail, and calls us princes, when it is by his grace and power that we are able to overcome. Over against the condescending grace at Bethel, which revealed the open way to Heaven, we get at Peniel a glimpse of the finished High Priestly work of our Intercessor, making the unworthy Jacobs, princes of God in renouncing worldly aid and in relying on divine power.

The result of this plea, was the change in Esau from the dreaded enemy to a reconciled brother. Some may think little of such an answer to prayer. There was no miracle such as men may expect who

watch for signs. It was simply the victory over a heart turned from its purpose and answering to the quiet demand of love, instead of vengeance, crushing with the sword and sending cries and desolation through the camp of the helpless. And this new name given to the Conqueror has little of the ring, which men love, who are brevetted on the battle field. And yet here is a man who has learned the great lesson of all true conquest, that God is greater than man and that he who wins there, must bow the knee in prayer. Jacob was first won to God, before he could win Esau to himself. To some Jacob may seem as little transformed at Penuel as at Bethel. He was Jacob still down to the end of his days. He had not a little of human weakness left in him, when in sadness he said all these things are against me: (42:36). But our weak human nature was to learn through him the short-sightedness of men in comparison with the far-reaching goodness of the plans of God. But Jacob showed the power of grace, in selfishness changed to justice and magnanimity, in self-dependence changed to trust in God, in the victory of love over hate. And then as Moses and Samuel showed what their mothers were, so Joseph showed what his father was. And then Joseph exalted knew the worth of that father who though despised as a shepherd, he could present to Pharaoh as a man of God whose blessing could enrich a king. In communion with God he spoke as a prophet. And in his death no one in all the land of Egypt was more honored.

CHAPTER XII

JOSEPH, OR THE EXALTATION AND TRIUMPH OF RELIGION IN THE INDIVIDUAL LIFE

It is but natural as we have the fundamental expression of religious life in faith, and prayer that we should also have the result or growth in the exaltation of the individual and in his influence over others. We have seen something of this effect in the Patriarchs whose lives we have already considered; as in the manifest change and uplifting of character in Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. The latter especially exhibits a marked change from a selfish person, disposed to rely on human expedients to a man of prayer who could plead only the mercy of God. Not only was Jacob's life corrected and purified, but he was the father and instructor of Joseph who is one of the most perfect characters in all history. It is in him that we especially see the growth and culmination of religious ideas as started in the call of Abraham and illustrated in this first chapter of Old Testament worthies. If we had no clearer light, this record would show what religion is and ought to be, in the faith, obedience and uplift of those who follow its teachings.

The history of Joseph falls naturally into three periods. 1. That of his home life for seventeen years. 2. His life of humiliation as a slave and

prisoner until he was thirty. 3. His exaltation as ruler of Egypt—a period extending to his death at a hundred and ten.

I. JOSEPH'S HOME LIFE

Joseph seems to have been gifted with a nature peculiarly lovable and receptive to the truth. This was perhaps one reason why he was a favorite of the father, as well as the fact that he was the son of the beloved wife. It was evidently the intention of Jacob to assign him the position of first-born. This was indicated by giving him the coat of many colors or as it is usually translated of a long tunic with sleeves (37:3 Rev. ver. margin.) In China this would be the garment of the scholar or officer instead of that worn by the coolie or workman. This would be sufficient to arouse the enmity of his brethren. They would say, he is placed before us, who are older than he. In addition to this jealousy Joseph was cognizant of the evil deeds of his brethren and reported them to his father. What these deeds were is not recorded. Caravans passed in those days to Egypt; and Driver's supposition that there was some dishonesty in the sale of flocks is not improbable. In addition to these causes of enmity Joseph repeated the dreams, which seem to have been given him as a divine intimation of his future advancement. If he had been older perhaps prudence would have led him to have kept those dreams to himself. However if he made any mistake about

this, it was purposely allowed as part of the chain in the providential leading, which was to bring about the desired result. Its first effect was to provoke the brothers to hinder an outcome which seemed improbable and yet one that they could not face out of their minds. It was hard for ten men to agree on the best method of ridding themselves of the dreamer. Murder was the surest. But from that some recoiled. Their point was gained as they supposed by selling him to a party of Ishmaelites who were on their way to Egypt. Now he would be out of their way; and they could say an evil beast had devoured him. This false report would deceive their father, especially as they brought back his coat covered with blood. One of the things which afterwards troubled their memories, was that they saw the anguish of his soul and would not hear (42:21). To Joseph it must have seemed a sad ending to his life's hopes, where he, a lad of seventeen, was sold as a slave and taken away into an unknown land to be again sold to some hard bondage.

The lesson of this part of Joseph's life, is the value of religious instruction in the family. That Abraham practised it we see from the influence such instruction had over the servant sent to find a wife for Isaac, and God himself said, I know that he will command his children and household after him, that they may keep the way of Jehovah. (18:19). That Jacob sought to do his part faithfully in this matter is seen in Joseph, who, at the

age of seventeen, was thrown into entirely different surroundings. We shall see how he met these surroundings as we go on. Now we wish to look at the instruction which helped to keep him faithful in the hour of trial. Certainly one thing which had a strong hold upon him, was the presence of God. He was no local God, for he was present in Egypt as well as at his father's altars. He had been with his father at Bethel and Penuel and in Mesopotamia as well as in Canaan. He was the God who had instituted sacrifice way back when Adam and Eve fled from Paradise. He knew of the sacredness of the marriage tie and how God regarded any deviation from that law as wicked and deserving of punishment. Whether this knowledge came from its first institution or from later teachings respecting it, we cannot say. And if the human relationships were thus made clear, the divine side in creation—the power and goodness as given in the first chapters of Genesis may have been handed down by tradition. Tradition would apparently be the source. And yet we know that the code of Hammurabi was written in the time of Abraham. And how much earlier writing was employed we cannot say. And then through those long years of waiting and preparation, the Patriarchs may have thought profoundly on what seems to us the few truths of revelation. Take this one thought of God's being and presence, how it entered into the fibre of Joseph's thinking and acting.

II. JOSEPH'S HUMILIATION

There are three ways in which this thought of God's presence showed itself in the next period of his life. 1. There was a cheerful acceptance of the position in which he was placed. However hard to be a slave and be torn away from his father's home as shown in the anguish of his soul, yet he did not sit down and mope or meditate vengeance. Doubtless he came to the conclusion that the hand of God was in the hard method his brethren took of ridding themselves of him, and so there was a ready attempt to make himself useful and seek the good of the master to whom he was sold. This disposition was seen by his first master, who gave him the position of major-domo or superintendent of his affairs. And then again, when by false accusation, he was thrown into prison, he wasted no time in self-justification or complaint against others, even though his feet were hurt with fetters (Ps. 105: 18). So manifestly was the Lord with him that the keeper of the prison entrusted the other prisoners to his over sight. This cheerfulness and readiness to serve and adapt one's self to surroundings may not seem a great grace, but it is in the line of obedience to God's will.

2. More positive was his mastery over temptation. He did not stop to consider the pleasure with which Satan is wont to bait his hook in such cases, nor the circumstances favorable to concealment. It was sin against God, and he ran from it as

quickly as possible. Where so many are slain, it was a victory, the example of which has helped others in the same fight through the ages.

3. His trust in God helped him in his treatment of his brethren and gave him the victory over every thought of resentment. At first the position which he took may have seemed harsh. He knew not what kind of men his brethren were—whether unfeeling and ready for some wicked deed, as when he left them. His first thought seems to have been to get possession of his younger brother. But as he saw the tender solicitude of Judah for his father and how he had become responsible for Benjamin's safe return, he no longer restrained himself, but seeing the providential intent that his father and all his brethren and their families should be saved alive, sends chariots and food for them all to come to Egypt. Not only did he thus manifest kindness in the beginning and receive them graciously; but when, after his father's death, they began to think he would requite the evil which they had done unto him. Nobly and generously did he reply, that while they meant it for evil, God meant it for good, and assured them, I will nourish you and your little ones. And he comforted them and spake kindly unto them (50: 16-21).

The first thought suggested by this period of Joseph's life, is the wonderful providence of God. We hardly wonder at the view which Jacob took of the situation, before it was fully developed.

All these things are against me, was his complaint. How little did the selling Joseph as a slave and the false accusation of his master's wife look like advancement. How the forgetfulness of the chief butler seemed to put it off still further. And yet it was all working to the result prognosticated to the boy in his dreams. The lessons suggested by such providential leading are those suggested by Joseph's actions, first to accept cheerfully what seems hard and difficult. And yet this is not an easy task, nor one quickly learned. Joseph began the task in anguish of soul and ended it by becoming trusted master in every position in which he was placed. Second, we are to stand fearlessly and positively by the right. The consciousness of rectitude carries with it not only the smile of one's best self, but the blessing of Jehovah.

JOSEPH A TYPE OF THE MESSIAH

Instead of taking up the next period of Joseph's life, or that of his exaltation, it seems best to take up the thought of his being a type of the Messiah, which necessarily brings in also some things connected with his humiliation. This position of a Messianic type was a new step in the development of revelation. The first step was the promise to our first parents of victory over the serpent, through the seed of the woman. This was confirmed to Abraham and a new idea added by making his seed a source of blessing to all the

families of the earth. In addition to the promise was the institution of sacrifice, showing a way of reconciliation through substitution. And now a third thought is added that the promised deliverer had his forerunner in such a person as Joseph. It is not necessary to hold that Joseph himself or his contemporaries should have understood this; but that we, looking back, see how certain features in some of the worthies of the Old Testament foreshadowed the person and work of Christ. Moses as the introducer of one Dispensation, speaks of another Prophet like himself whom God would raise up to do a similar work, but most of these forerunners went on doing their own work, unconscious of its significance. We are specially interested in seeing how much of truth was foreshadowed in their conduct. Thus in Joseph there is, first, the exaltation growing out of his humiliation. The road to the prime ministry was through slavery. Christ was exalted both because of his work and his character. He stands alone in exalting us through his death—but in a measure it could be said of Joseph as of Christ, “thou hast loved righteousness and hated iniquity, therefore hath God exalted thee” (Ps. 45:7). There is also the striking external fact that one was sold and the other betrayed for the same price—thirty pieces of silver.

Second, There was the saving much people alive. In the one case it was the family of Jacob—the chosen seed. On the other it was a great multi-

tude whom no man can number. In the one case it was from starvation. In the other an eternal salvation from sin and its curse here and hereafter.

Third, The method of saving by forgiveness was one of the striking points in which Joseph was a type of Christ. Joseph was tempted to retaliate, and perhaps thought he ought to, when he accused them of being spies. And his brethren expected nothing else after the death of their father. But he had been learning God's purpose in bringing him into Egypt to save, and that purpose could only be carried out by forgiveness. The victory of the world over its enemies is by force, by revenge and hate. Christ's victory is by love—by mercy and forgiveness. Here was a foreshadowing of the divine way, which must have made its impression on those who were taught so much by type and symbol. It is true that we are not to read too much of gospel teaching into the Old Testament record, neither on the other hand are we to minimize the truth designed to help the faith that looked to the future. Sacrifice and Jacob's vision, made clear that the way to heaven was open. It was open to such a man as Jacob. And it was open to Jacob's sons, who evidently were not worthy, but who still were saved, forgiven and treated kindly, by the very person they had injured.

Fourth, Still another thought was that the perfection of this salvation was in the future. Joseph "took an oath of the children of Israel saying,

God will surely visit you, and ye shall carry up my bones from hence" (50:25). He was confident that the promise to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob would be fulfilled, and that Canaan should be theirs. While there was this earthly hope and the type was complete in his belief in the promise, the question may arise whether he was equally certain about the heavenly Canaan. Joseph lived for the most of his life, where they sought to realize immortality by keeping the body from corruption. This shows the longing of the human mind to escape death. The Egyptians carried this to an extreme when they made mummies of cats and bulls. But beyond the care of the mortal, there is the innate longing for continued existence which is a part of our nature. When God made man in his own image, a part of that image was to be immortal, just as God himself is. And though man fell, yet the immortal was not annihilated, nor the hope of it banished through sin and corruption. As reason and conscience existed though dethroned, so with the hope of immortality, though death was pronounced. This hope was strengthened before the Flood by the translation of Enoch. When God called Abraham, there was not only a promise about the possession of Canaan, but a statement of his relation to God, that in him personally, rather than in his gifts, would be "his exceeding great reward" (15:1). In the unseen and spiritual he was to look for his support and joy, more than in the earthly. To Jacob was

given the vision of the open heavens and the way of access there. He felt that alone there in Bethel he was near God's home and close by the gateway to Heaven, up which the angels invited him to ascend. Very properly therefore does the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews describe the Patriarchs as seeking a heavenly country, and that God had prepared for them as well as us a City (Heb. 11: 13-16). Joseph we must consider as a sharer in these hopes of immortality. God was to him a Saviour, causing good to come out of evil, ruling Egypt as well as Canaan as its sovereign, having his home in Heaven. The earthly promise was only a part—a foretaste of those open gates which his father saw, when the angels ascended and descended to help the human towards the divine.

UNITY OF REVELATION

1. After having passed in review the first chapter of divine revelation, or the beginnings of grace as shown to the individual, the first thought that impresses us is the unity of the divine plan and purpose in Revelation. It is as the Apostle says, "the gospel preached beforehand to Abraham" (Gal. 3: 6). It was not only that Christ should come—but that salvation is for sinners like Jacob—through faith like Abraham—breathed out in prayer, as in Jacob changed to Israel. And then in Joseph we have the type of the forgiving, exalted Saviour. Surely here is not a little of the fundamentals of the gospel foreshadowed for the

guidance of believers before Christ came in the flesh.

REVELATION FROM GOD

2. The unity of Revelation emphasizes the fact that its beginnings as well as its fulness are from God. The fruit is the outcome of the blossom which began when Abraham was called out of Ur of the Chaldees. That there should have been so much of truth revealed then, when all the world was going astray, shows clearly that its source was not Babylonian or of any other human origin, but from God.

SUFFERING AND EXALTATION

3. It is a little singular how the two ideas of a suffering and an exalted Saviour—which seemed to the Jews so irreconcilable—were kept side by side all through the Old Testament. The two great sources for faith and thought to dwell upon were type and promise—type indicated that the way of access to God was by blood, and on the other hand was the promise of victory and blessing through the seed of Abraham. In Joseph as a type of Christ two ideas were combined—humiliation and exaltation, slavery and kingly power. As the humiliation was on earth so would the exaltation be, Egypt governed by the word of Joseph, or the world accepting the laws and principle of the kingdom of Heaven. The humiliation was of a different character in David, the great national type of the Messiah. There was more of

suffering because of sin, and patient waiting for the kingdom, but yet it was triumph and subjugation of enemies, and the exaltation prolonged in Solomon's peaceful and prosperous reign. In this anticipated glory of the Son of David, suffering and humiliation were forgotten, and so they rejected the Christ when he actually came in the flesh. May the reverse not be true of us that we forget his exultation and second coming; and so neglect to co-work with him in establishing the spiritual, which is ever true glory of his reign upon the earth.

CHAPTER XIII

THE FAMILY—(1) MARRIAGE

The first step in the beginnings of things in grace is the relation of the individual soul to God. The next step is the relation of the family to God. With reference to the family we begin with marriage. For upon the right understanding of that relation, depends very largely the happiness and right influence of the home.

1. The *origin* of marriage is given in the second chapter of Genesis. God made an help suited for man, as it was plain from want of congenial companionship that it was not good for him to be alone. The beasts had been brought before Adam and he had named them. If he had descended from them, he might have found the remove from them not too great, to prevent companionship. But the father of our race was not a brute, nor the son of a brute, but made by his Creator to rule over them. The formation of woman from man, and in a single pair, was significant of the law of marriage. Animals seem to have been created in groups or swarms—but here is one man and one woman, indicating a monogamous instead of a polygamous union. And besides this, the intimacy of the union was signified. It was bone of his bone and flesh of his flesh. So that the rule starts from the very beginning. “Therefore, shall a man leave his father and his mother and shall

cleave unto his wife; and they shall be one flesh" (v. 24). A union so perfect was not to be interfered with, either by taking other wives, or by divorce, except when there is a fundamental violation of the contract by either of the parties. To this original law, our Saviour brought back the institution, saying to the plea of the Jews that Moses had allowed divorce for other reasons, "In the beginning it was not so" (Matt. 19: 8). This primal law of Paradise was enforced by various incidents in the course of the narrative.

The first temptation to vary from the marriage contract was presented to Abraham in the fact that the promise seemed likely to fail through want of offspring. After what seemed a very long waiting, Sarah persuaded her husband to take her maid as his concubine. But the promised seed was not to be through Hagar, but by the lawful wife. It is true there is nothing said about the unlawfulness of the secondary marriage; but the natural results in a disturbed household were plainly manifest. The concubine, as the mother as she supposed, of the promised heir, was led to despise her mistress and this led to her banishment from home, even before the birth of Ishmael. And then when Isaac was weaned, Sarah, jealous of what was perhaps boyish raillery on the part of his half-brother, who was fourteen years the senior, insisted upon the bondwoman and her son being cast out. It was not easy for Abraham to consent to this, for his heart yearned towards his

eldest son, but directed by God, he followed his wife's advice. Ishmael, who doubtless, had been for a time recognized as son and heir of his father's position and wealth, was remanded back to his mother's servile position. If this was not a rebuke to the departure from the law of matrimony, it certainly was honor put on the original marriage as the one to be recognized in the line of promise.

1. The trouble and difficulty in a polygamous marriage is again brought to life in the case of Jacob. The one whom he chose and who would have been his only wife, was Rachel. But Laban, who cared more for the customs of the country than his promise gave him Leah instead of Rachel—so eventually he had four wives instead of one. Rachel the loved one, envied Leah because the children were hers, and Leah envied Rachel the affection of her husband. Rachel, however, continued to hold the primary place in Jacob's affection, and her children were the honored and also the envied ones in the household. If the sons of Jacob had all been the sons of one mother, it is hardly to be supposed that the plot against Joseph would have assumed such dark proportions, as to plan against his life, and then sell him as a slave.

2. While there was this clear intimation that marriage should be confined to one man and one woman, there was no positive prohibition against polygamy. With reference however, to the sanctity of marriage, which polygamy does so much to

weaken, the teaching was very explicit. On two different occasions, once in Egypt and once in Canaan, was this lesson taught Abraham (chs. 12 and 20). Abraham was fearful that in his wanderings among powerful princes, he would be taken and killed for the sake of his wife; so he persuaded her to say that she was his sister. Doubtless there was ground for this fear, and Sarah seems to have been actually taken to the harems of Pharaoh and Abimelech. How Abraham expected to recover his wife, we do not know, but it became an occasion of divine rebuke in both instances. The design of rebuke was to teach in the most emphatic way possible, the sanctity of the marriage relation. The tie was indissoluble, admitting of no trifling or laying aside. It was better even to run the risk of losing life itself, than to violate this union. There was a rebuke of Abraham's prevarication and want of trust in God's providence, Abimelech also was threatened with death, if he did not restore the woman whom he had unwittingly taken, and the reason given was that she was a man's wife. (20:3). It is a little singular that Isaac should have committed over again the mistake of his father, and in the same place, three-quarters of a century later (26:7). He was rebuked by Abimelech, who seemed to remember better than Isaac, the warning given to his father; and did not proceed as far in attempting to take her away from her husband. This threefold repetition shows the prone-

ness of men to disregard the sanctity of this relation, and how positively it was the purpose of God to enforce the rule on this subject and guard it by the strongest penalties. We see the effect of this teaching in the case of Joseph. The temptation came in a way so easy to be concealed, that it was only a strong sense of the greatness of the sin that made him proof against it. He had been taught by the way God had dealt with his ancestors, that he should beware of incurring his displeasure. He would trust in God's providence to vindicate the right, and he did not trust in vain.

Another lesson about the sanctity of marriage is inculcated in this connection with reference to continence between unmarried persons, as in the case of Dinah (ch 34). The sin was not in its worst form, as marriage was proposed, but the insult and disgrace to their sister, her two brothers were determined should be revenged. The manner of showing this resentment cannot be justified, but the deed done was wrong. Perhaps the vengeance was allowed, to show in the midst of those nations the necessity for moral purity. And the restraint, which kept them from pursuing the sons of Jacob, doubtless had the approval of conscience, that though conducted with too great violence, it was in a measure justified because of sin against virtue. And for this reason it was recorded that sin in this direction is to be carefully guarded for the sake of the purity and peace of society. For men are prone to excuse and allow indulgence in

themselves, which if committed against those related to them, they punish with the utmost severity.

3. Another point upon which light is thrown is the mode of entering upon this relation. Marriage in the Lord, or marriage on the ground of religious rather than worldly considerations, is more than once set forth. The first plain violation of such religious considerations was before the Flood, when the sons of God* or the worshippers of Jehovah took them wives of all which they chose. Not only does this indicate a tendency to polygamy, but the choice was not based on religious grounds, but on mere fancy, or as the record says, because they were fair. The giving up of a religious basis as the ground of choice, resulted in the bad education of their offspring, who became men of renown—or as Calvin says “the first nobility of the world were honorable robbers, who boasted of their wickedness.” And because of this

* Driver holds that “the Sons of God” were semi-divine, *supra* mundane beings. “It is not apparent,” he says, “why the intermarriage of two races each descended from a common ancestor should have resulted in a race characterized by gigantic stature or abnormal wickedness.” We must see in it an ancient Hebrew legend or (to use Delitzsch’s expression) a piece of ‘unassimilated mythology’ the intention of which was to account for the origin of a supposed race of pre-historic giants (Comp. on Gen 6: 3). It is well known, however, that theocratical magistrates as representations of God’s judicial sovereignty are expressly called Elohim or gods (see Alexander p. 82: 1). And so the term sons of God or gods to represent worshippers of God agrees first with the uniform teaching of the Bible that the origin of the human race is from one pair, and second, only with this rendering does the religious bearing of the text have any value.

wickedness the catastrophe of the Deluge was visited upon the old world.

When the sons of Abraham and Isaac were to be married, the question of the proper person to be selected, was a matter of no little solicitude. Had they been governed by a worldly policy an alliance with some of the princes among whom they were located would have seemed wisdom. It would apparently have made their residence among them safe and pleasant. But then the patriarchs saw that the result would have been to have gone down to their level. Lot's family became like those among whom they dwelt, copied their standard of morals and came near sharing in their destruction. With the determination therefore to keep free from idolatry and its evil practices, Abraham proposed to send his servant—supposed to be Eliezer of Damascus (15:2)—to Mesopotamia to seek a wife among his kindred for his son (ch. 24). He believed the Lord would send his angel and prosper the errand of his faithful servant. But if the one sought would not come, Isaac was not to go there to live (v. 7, 8). Doubtless at the age of forty, he had been consulted in this matter and was willing to abide by a decision which was prompted by religious rather than carnal notions. He must have seen those in surrounding tribes that would have attracted the eye—but with him as with his father and the faithful Eliezer there was a disposition to abide the guidance of the good providence of God. His

religious character and the way he treated this matter is seen, when, near the expected time of the return of the camels, he went out into the field to meditate—a word associated in the Psalms with meditation on religious subjects (See Ps. 119: 15, 23 and 27). In the same spirit that the servant asked to be guided in finding the one whom the Lord had appointed, he would hope and ask that the journey and the object of it might be blessed and terminated successfully.

Jacob's quest in the same direction and for a similar object, was mixed up with the desire to escape from the wrath of his brother; but still the main object in his going must have seemed near a realization when he saw the beautiful Rachel and loved her with such ardor that the seven years of service for her, seemed but a few days.

The space taken up with these narratives and the divine guidance involved, show that religious considerations and prayer for guidance should control our thought and action in this important step of life.

It is difficult to leave this subject without a remark or two. 1. The primal law of marriage is not one evolved by man's experience, but one laid down by the Creator at the very beginning. It is one which man has been disposed to disobey; but the experience of mankind, as well as the authority of Christ, which brings us back to this primal law, has proved to be the wisest and best.

2. That if men acted on the conviction, that

religious considerations should control their actions in this matter, and should seek divine guidance before entering upon such an intimate life union, there would be less disposition to dissolve it by seeking a divorce.

3. Literature and public sentiment need to be educated to see that love, like all other affections and impulses of our nature, is to be under the control of the divine will. Fancy and passion may be strong, but if wrong, they must be conquered. Love at sight or the power of passion are not the polar stars, which are to indicate our course in life, as if the Fates or Cupid were our gods instead of the Lord of heaven and earth. Let love to him be first, and not love to the creature. The bride sought in obedience to duty and to whose presence and home, the faithful servant, in answer to prayer was guided, became, though he had never seen her, the beloved wife of Isaac. A mother's loss, who had loved him as her only child and as the child of promise, was more than made good in this new relation. Our methods are different, but the underlying principle should be the same. And the result in life long happiness will mark heaven's approval.

CHAPTER XIV

THE FAMILY—(2) THE TRAINING OF CHILDREN

We have seen how in the primal law of marriage God had regard for the family, 1st, in guarding against promiscuous marriage as among beasts, which, according to some, was the condition of our ancestors; and 2d, against polygamous marriage, which would have entailed envy, jealousy and murder as seen in the most favorable circumstances in the household of Jacob; or 3d, guarding against any method of concubinage or divorce. God honored the original bond, as in the case of Sarah and her son, instead of Hagar and Ishmael. Three times was the law of the sancity of marriage, which admitted of no trifling, much less of divorce, repeated to Abraham and Isaac. And Joseph stood by the rule, thus inculcated, even to imprisonment under a false accusation.

More directly with regard to the family, these three things show the importance of religion in that relation. 1st, the acceptance of the seal of the covenant. 2d, the position given to worship by the head of the household. 3d, the recognition of the duty of training children.

ACCEPTANCE OF THE SEAL OF THE COVENANT

1. With reference to the first, the acceptance of

the seal of the covenant, it is not important whether that seal was something new and given to Abraham for the first time, or whether it had been in use among the Egyptians before this period. Baptism, as a rite and significant of cleansing, had been in use long before Christ set it apart, as connected with the Christian system. "Circumcision was practised as early as the period of the 2d dynasty (3998-3721 B. C. Petrie), and whence Herodotus declares that the custom spread to the Ethiopians, the Phoenicians and the Syrians of Palestine (i. e., the Jews)" (See Driver's Gen. p. 189). The difficulty is to account for the introduction and continuance of such a rite. Driver suggests that it was an initiation into manhood. The age at which it was performed was seven to ten in Egypt, and among the Ishmaelites thirteen, according to the age of their ancestor, when he received the rite. If this is the correct statement about circumcision among the nations, it was a very different thing as practised by the Jews. The time for its performance was in infancy—when the child was eight days old. And then it was a sign of a covenant. God on his part, promised to be a God unto them, and to give them the land of their sojournings for an everlasting possession. In making the children partakers of the sign of the covenant, the idea was that they were included in the blessing promised to their fathers. Parents give their worldly possessions to their children and in this rite, God took hold of

the parental instinct and continues the blessing, and promises of religion to succeeding generations.

Another idea dwelt upon at a later period, was the spiritual import of circumcision, and that was the subjugation of carnal appetites to the divine law. The heart, as well as the body, was to be circumcised.

As far, however, as the family was concerned, this rite drew the children into allegiance to the God of Israel. They were consecrated by the parents to his service and were to be co-partners in the blessings promised.

WORSHIP IN THE HOUSEHOLD

2. Another mark of family religion and of the fact that he was a worshipper of Jehovah was the prominence given to that worship, especially by Abraham, whenever he pitched his tent. He did so at his very first coming into the land of Canaan, when the Lord appeared unto him, (12:7) and at his next removal repeated it, building an altar and calling upon the name of the Lord (12:8). So also at Hebron (13:18) and at Beersheba, where he planted a grove and called on the name of the Lord, the everlasting God (21:33). It is significantly said of his first appearance in this region, "and the Canaanite was then in the land" (12:6). In the midst of an

idolatrous* people, Abraham comes with his company of 1500 to 2000 persons, accompanied with their flocks and herds, and is especially distinguished from the people by whom he was surrounded, as a worshipper of Jehovah—the living and true God. Abraham was the head of a nomadic tribe and could arm over three hundred men for war, but he was not a warrior, except when necessity required. He was not a mere herdsman—feeding and caring for his flocks, but the distinguishing feature of his life was that he believed in and worshipped an unseen God. An altar dedicated to him, was in the center of his encampment, and doubtless smoked with the burning of the morning and evening sacrifice. Abraham acted as the head and priest of his family, and would, in this respect, be followed by the other patriarchs, as they followed his example in practising the rite of circumcision. For typical reasons a change was made in the priesthood, limiting it to the family of Aaron. But

* While it is evident that the majority of the Canaanites were idolators, yet there were remains of a more correct faith. Melchisedek is called a priest of the most high God and seems from his age or position to have held a recognized supremacy over the surrounding chieftains (14:18-20). Abimelech warned of God recognized who it was that addressed him, calling him Lord and feeling that he could not destroy the righteous (20:3). Abraham it is true feared that that knowledge of God was slight (5:11). The degeneracy of Sodom showed that there at least, the fear of God had lost its practical effect. And as idolatry had crept into the family of Laban in the time of Rachel (31:19) so it seems to have made more positive inroads among the tribes of Canaan. Hence the need of new testimony on the part of Abraham before these natives were cut off.

the religious service of which the altar was the type, belongs in all generations, to the head of the family. He is the priest and leader in religious thought and devotion in that little world of influence, which helps so mightily in building up religion in the Church and in the State. The example of Abraham is set before us as the rule for all families, and one of the ways, by which the clearer gospel brought through the seed of Abraham, is to bless all the families of the earth.

FAMILY INSTRUCTION

3. With regard to the direct training of children and servants, there is this statement on the part of Jehovah himself, "For I have known him to the end that he may command his children and his household after him, that they may keep the way of the Lord to do justice and judgment (18:19 R. V.). Abraham had already been twenty-five years in the promised land and what he had already done was evidence that he would continue in the same path of duty. There is a slight difference of meaning in the R. V. from the authorized,—the former emphasizing the fact that the purpose of God was to continue in Abraham's descendants a recognition of true religion in doing justice and judgment, by this family training. The hope for the perpetuity of religion from one generation to another, rested upon the proper care of parents in the government of children. The term *command* shows an authority on

the part of parents, which is not exercised, and not even thought of, by the majority of parents in these days. Government was patriarchal, which, in the family where love restrains undue authority, ought to be wise. The kind of training* exercised in the family, or household, outside of the children, was reflected in the servant, who was sent to Mesopotamia, to secure a wife for Isaac. His implicit reliance on divine guidance showed an amount of faith and trust which would have done credit to his master Abraham. This training of the household has passed out of modern experience almost entirely. If, in our altered circumstances, the responsibility could be felt and acted upon that the religious condition of those employed or dependent upon us, rested upon the master or employer, some of the evils which now threaten society might be averted. There is a proper Christian communism, where labor and capital, employer and employee, master and servant, meet on a common level, before the one Lord and Father of us all. This idea was set forth as well as it could be in that dispensation by servant and master sharing in the same religious rites and by the master feeling the responsibility and care of his household in instructing them as well as his children.

* Some might think when Abraham took 318 trained servants to rescue Lot, that the training was especially for war. But while such discipline may not have been neglected, other incidents show that another training was as carefully attended to, which would help in the service and worship of God.

It should, perhaps, be noticed that this reference to family training is placed in connection with that remarkable destruction of the cities of the plain. As elsewhere in the Bible, there are twofold motives given for obedience—one by the blessings promised, and the other by punishment on disobedience. It was on this occasion that the birth of Isaac was definitely promised (18:9-15), when, according to human expectations, it seemed impossible. And, at the same time, by the destruction of the cities of the plain (ch. 19), was enforced the lesson of Lot's mistaken choice in locating his family where the surroundings were favorable for the accumulation of property, but exceedingly bad for the training of his family; and where the lesson of destruction upon the wicked was so placed upon the borders of the promised land that it should be a constant reminder to the children of Israel that however sin might prosper for a time, it would not go unpunished.

Note.—In order to understand the destruction of the cities of the plain, it is not necessary to suppose that the Dead or Salt Sea had no existence before the time of Abraham. Geologists affirm that it existed from early Tertiary times. (Dawson on "Science in Bible Lands," p. 481.) But that does not settle the question about its extent or the subsidence of portions of its shores. Some think that the southern portion below the peninsula, which was only a depth of about thir-

teen feet, whereas the northern end has an average depth of over one thousand feet, is the site of these cities. Others think that the plain of the Jordan which Lot chose, and which could be seen from Bethel was the location. The bituminous condition of the soil, the presence of salt and sulphur, and possibly earthquake changes in a region where they are so common, would account for the overthrow of those cities, as so vividly described by an apparent eye-witness: "The smoke of the country went up as the smoke of a furnace." (19:28).

CHAPTER XV

BEGINNINGS OF GRACE IN THE NATION

In speaking of the beginning of things in grace, the plan was to speak of the beginnings of grace first in the individual, then in the family, and lastly in the nation. Logically this would have involved an attempt to follow the Jewish nation (1) in its deliverance from Egypt, (2) its period of instruction in the wilderness, and (3) their settlement in the land of promise. Such an attempt necessitated a survey of the remaining books of the Pentateuch and the book of Joshua. As this would have required another volume, I content myself with stating some of the principles upon which such a survey would have been conducted.

GOD THE AUTHOR OF REVELATION

1. It has been a great satisfaction to reach the conclusion, that not only did God create the world and place man, whom he made in his image, to rule it, but that when he fell, he began a plan of salvation reaching through the ages—a plan whose fundamental principles are the same, and yet vary as the blossom differs from the fruit.

CHANGES IN FORM OF WORSHIP

2. The changes cluster around certain lines, which already appear in the treatment of the in-

dividual in Genesis. These changes appear especially in sacrifice or the way of approach to God. (1) The first change was in the officer or priest. In Genesis it was the head of the family or tribe. Henceforth it was to center in one Great High Priest as the head of the nation and a type of the high priesthood of Christ. With him were to serve the members of his family as priests and the tribe of Levi as helpers to the priest. (2) Change in the victim or sacrifice was from an unwritten to a written and elaborate code. Abel offered a lamb of the flock. Noah "took of every clean beast and of every clean bird and offered burnt offerings upon the altar" (Gen. 8:20). In the Mosaic Dispensation different beasts or birds were assigned for different offences. The third change was in the erection of a tabernacle with its worship, instead of the now simple worship at an altar wherever the tent was pitched. This worship defined more clearly the method of approach to God—first by the brazen altar the blood of the substitute, then the cleansing, and the golden altar in the holy place, before God, in his supreme essence and glory was revealed to the worshipper. These changes required one place of worship, one altar, one Sanctuary. This one Sanctuary was at first the Tabernacle, and then the Temple. An objection has been made that the Deuteronomic code inculcated one Sanctuary, and that this is post-exitic. But the one Sanctuary grew out of the change in the High Priest-

hood of Aaron and the laws respecting sacrifices, and belongs to Exodus. And these things Moses repeats at the close of his life, as he had, at the command of God, instituted them forty years before. That there should have been a return to the old method of family and tribal worship under Samuel, after the capture of the ark, and under Elijah and Elisha, when these prophets sought to bring back the ten tribes to the worship of the God of their fathers, was natural and excusable. And then there is a tendency to increasing strictness in the observance of an outward form. Thus the Sabbath, reconsecrated at Sinai, was post-exitic in the strictness of its observance. Circumcision was Abrahamic, but the time for the rigid enforcement of the rite grew as the centuries passed. The same thing we should expect to be true about the one central Sanctuary. And so the facts of the case only confirm rather than overthrow the plain historical statement.

TYPICAL CHARACTER OF THE OLD TESTAMENT

3. It is to be remembered that the typical character which was introduced in the book of Genesis is kept up through the whole Old Testament history. Joseph was a type of Christ, and Moses claimed that a prophet of the New would be raised up, as he was a prophet of the Old. To one at all observant, it is surprising how often and constant these shadows and forecastings of the future appear in the details of worship and in the construction of the Tabernacle, as well as in

the general course of God's providence. Christ himself has given us an example of the way in which Old Testament events are to be interpreted. Manna was a wonderful provision for the Jews in the wilderness, but it was more than that. It was a type of himself as the true bread (John 6:41). Paul enlarges the same idea in its application to other things (as in 1 Cor. 10). With two such interpreters we are not to overlook the typical import of many things which, as simple history, are obscure. One or two examples will suffice. Canaan was a two-fold type (1) of the heavenly Canaan; (2) of the possession and subjugation of the world to Christ. In the literal conquest, thorough extermination of the inhabitants and of idolatry was required. With different weapons and with a higher end the spiritual subjugation should be carried on. Every knee must bow and every tongue confess. It is true that the purity of the nation and their separation from surrounding idolatry demanded severe measures. But beyond was the thought of complete and thorough subjection to the King of Kings. And this subjection was anything but hard-hearted and cruel. Similar was the teaching of loyalty and obedience, in subsequent history. It demanded harsh acts in the literal and outward type. But the lesson was absolutely necessary. To obey was better than sacrifice, and to hearken than the fat of lambs. And the teaching of that lesson, though it involved the hewing of Agag in

pieces, and the denunciation of enemies in the imprecatory psalms, should in no way detract from the character of God as loving and forgiving. David conquered his enemies to show that Christ would be victorious over all his foes—but when he thought to build a temple to God's praise he was not allowed to do it because he had been a man of war; and it was left for his son—a man of peace, typifying the great peace given. God is just, but he delights in mercy. It was a just deduction that a Jewish lawyer gave to Christ's enquiry about the teachings of the law, Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy soul, mind and strength (Luke 10:25). Love him because he has shown him self a God of Love.

The only correct and safe rule of Biblical interpretation is to follow the thought of God—the author of Revelation. If it be necessary in human interpretation to follow the spirit of thought of the author—how much more so in a revelation from God, to have the spirit of God (See 1 Cor., 2:10)—which sympathizes with his plans and the methods he has used in making himself known to the children of men.

INDEX

INDEX

- Abraham, call of, 115 f., 125 f.; courage of, 133; faith of, 129; home of, 126; hospitality of, 131; head of tribe, 171; friend of God, 132; forgiveness of, 133; journies of, 127; obedience of, 7, 129; parents of, 126; patience of, 130; prince of God, 133; priest, 172; trial of, 129; wife of, 127.
 Abbott, Dr. Lyman, 33.
 Abel, 69.
 Abimelech, 121.
 Adam, 39 ff.
 Adam, first and second, 69.
 Agag, 180.
 Allen, Dr. J., 35.
 Alter, 172, 178.
 Animals, clean and unclean, 103.
 Animal life, 33.
 Antidiluvian, sins of, 100.
 Ape-like man, 43.
 Atmosphere, 26.
 Arabs, 132.
 Argyll, Duke of, 92.
 Ark, 95, 102.

 Babel, 107.
 Babylon, 106.
 Baptism, 170.
 Balaam, 4.
 Bethel, 127, 140.
 Bible, authorship, 9, 42; critics of, 16 f; chronology of, 9; inspiration of I, 5; infallible, 4 f; revelation I, and science, 12; unity of, 6, 12 f; word of God I.
 Braested, 86.
 Brain development, of, 65.
 Buddhism, 15.
 Bunyan, 128.

 Cabell, Dr. 56.
 Cain and Abel, 69 f.
 Canaan, 134.
 Caucasian race, 55.
 Children Training of, 169 f.
 Children, 173.
 China, 14.
 Chinese Sacrifices of, 71.
 Chronology, 77, & 9 f.
 Chronology, Egyptian, 85.
 Chronology Babylonian, 85; Ushers, 85.
 Christ Joseph type of, 153.
 Circumcision, 118, 170.
 Clement, 5.
 Clay, Prof., 83.
 Coal beds, 29 f.
 Codrington, 110.
 Conscience, 47.
 Confucius, 14.
 Concubine, 161.
 Corruption, 51.
 Covenant People, 122.
 Covenant relation, 123.
 Covenant Seal of, 169 f.
 Creation, 3, 5, 21 ff; and Buddhism, 15; of man, 39 f, 42 f; plan of, 34; purpose in, 34.
 Dana, 29, 33, 43, 45, 93, 94, 95.
 Davis, 52.
 Dawson, 92, 175.
 Days in Genesis, 25.
 Dead Sea, 175 f.

- Dinah, 164.
 Driver, 21, 26, 49, 51, 53, 63, 64, 73, 83, 97, 165, 148, 170.
 Death, Physical, 65; spiritual, 65; eternal, 66.
 Documentary Theory, 40.
 Duty, 47.
 Eden, 59.
 Election, 117.
 Enoch, 4, 76.
 Erosion, 50.
 Esau, 121.
 Ethnological Records, 105 f.
 European, 57.
 Evolution, 35 ff, 49, 51.
 Eve, Mother of all mankind, 53.
 Fall, 6, 58 f, 50, 60 f, 69.
 Faith, 70.
 Fairbanks, 103.
 Family, 160, 169; instruction, 173.
 Fernander, 110.
 Flood, 16, 99 f; Babylonian story of, 97; limited, 96; Universality of, 98.
 Garden of Eden, 58 f.
 Geology, 80.
 Glacial Period, 44, 46, 91.
 Grace toward the Individual, 115.
 Green, Prof., 85.
 God. Creator, 2, 49; character of, 78; fatherhood of, 53; truthfulness of, 6 f; moral government of, 7; words of if, 6, 22; works of if, 6, 22.
 Guidance, 119.
 Guyot, 23.
 Haeckel, 25, 35.
 Hall, Wilford, 23.
 Hagar, 119.
 Hamilton, Sir William, 23.
 Hammurami Code, 127, 150.
 Haran, 127, 128.
 Henry, Matthew, 60.
 Hill's Theology, 72.
 Hindoo, 109.
 Holy Spirit, 8.
 Hottentot, 57.
 Household, Worship in, 171; training of, 174.
 Hunger for God, 48.
 Huxley, 43.
 Idolatry, 14, 117 f.
 Individual, 147; responsibility, 48.
 Indians, 56.
 Inundation mud, 92.
 Inspiration, 1 ff; verbal, 42.
 Image of God, 49.
 Immortality, 48, 63, 156.
 Isaac, 121, 123, 129, 136.
 Ishmael, 161.
 Jacob, 121 f; and Abraham, 136; and angel, 145; and birthright, 138; dream of, 140; and Esau, 137, 143; falsehood of, 138; humility of, 144; and Laban, 141; and Leah, 141; liberality of, 142; the supplanter, 137; and prayer, 135 f; vow of, 142.
 Jehovah, 41.
 Jesus, truthfulness of, 7 f; character of, 8; resurrection of, 8; reign of, 14.
 Job, 4, 6.
 Josephus, 136.
 Joseph, 122, 147 ff; cheerfulness of, 151; courage of, 153; dreams of, 148; sold into Egypt, 149; exaltation of, 154; forgiveness, 152, 155; his home life, 148; his home training, 150; humiliation of, 151; religion of, 150; resigna-

- tion of, 151; suffering of, 158; temptation of, 152; type of Messiah, 153.
- Kant, 82.
- Kawi Language, 110.
- Kent, 127.
- Knapp's Theology, 71.
- Laban, 121, 141, 143.
- Labor, 59.
- Land Depression of, 90.
- Land Creation of, 27 f.
- Lange, 109, 110.
- Lamech, 74, 76, 101.
- Leah, 162.
- LeConte, 28, 35, 36.
- Lemuria, 56.
- Lewis, 108.
- Life, author of, 23, 34; animal and vegetable, 34.
- Light, 24.
- Likeness to God, 49.
- Lot, 127, 132, 175.
- Love, 181.
- Man Antiquity of, 43; brotherhood of, 53; his communion with God, 48; creation of, 39 f, 42 f; created perfect, 63; when created, 80, 82; his place in creation, 34; before the flood, 87 f; immortality of, 47; moral being, 47 f; religious being, 47 f; spiritual nature of, 46 f; unity of, 53 f.
- Marriage, 54f, 130, 160f, 165; Abraham's violation of vows, 161; Christ view of, 161; divine guidance in, 168; of Isaac, 166; of Jacob, 167; Jacob's violation of vows, 162; Joseph regard for, 164; origin of, 160; primeval law of, 168.
- Matter, 22.
- Mastedon, 91, 94.
- Melchisdeck, 4, 117, 129.
- Menes, 86.
- Messianic promise, 118; prophecy, 104.
- Miracles, 12.
- Moral conflict, 66.
- Moral motive, 48.
- Moses mistakes of, 16.
- Mt. Gilead, 143.
- Mulanesian language, 110.
- Murder, 69 f.
- Myths, 5.
- Nahor, 127.
- Natural religion, 116.
- Nation grace in, 177.
- Nature human, 49.
- Naram-Sin, 85.
- Nimrod, 107.
- Noah, 4.
- Obedience, 59.
- Offering, 178; Offering, Cain's, 72.
- Old Testament typical, 179.
- Orr, Dr., 46, 80.
- Ought, 47.
- Padan Aran, 140.
- Paliolithic Man, 44.
- Pantheism, 23.
- Pasteur, 25.
- Patriarchs, 122.
- Paul, 137.
- Peloubet, 127.
- Penuel, 143.
- Petrie, 86.
- Polygamy, 101.
- Population before the flood, 98.
- Prayer, 135.
- Presturch, Prof., 92.
- Priest, 178; high, 179.
- Promise the first, 66.
- Prophecy, 11.
- Protevangalism, 66.

- Providence, 3, 152.
 Psalm Imprecatory, 13.
 Punishment, 62.
 Pyramids, 111.

 Race beginning of, 56; distribution of, 56 f, 106; from God, 158; unity of, 55, 108.
 Rachel, 162.
 Rain, 58 f.
 Reason, 47.
 Rebekah, 139.
 Redway and Himman's Geography, 44.
 Revelation and Grace, 3; method of, 4 f; God author of, 158, 177; unity of, 157.

 Sabbath, 39, 179.
 Sacrifice, 67, 123; human, 71; institution of, 2, 3.
 Salvation, 3.
 Sanscrit, 109.
 Sayce, 127.
 Savage, 48.
 Science and the Bible, 2; and revelation, 21, 59.
 Serpent, 60.
 Seth, 75.
 Sin, 78 f; origin of, 51.
 Sons of God, 76, 165.
 Speech, 47, 107.
 Spiritual nature, 48.
 Spontaneous generation, 25, 28, 35.

 Stanley, 125, 131.
 Stars, 31.
 St. Augustine, 25.
 Substitution, 70.
 Succession, 34.
 Subjection of all nations, 179.
 Suffering and Exaltation, 158.

 Tabernacle, 2, 178.
 Tablets, 112.
 Temple, 2, 178.
 Tertiary period, 45.
 Theist and Evolutionist, 35.
 Thompson, Sir William, 28.
 Tongues confusion of, 105.
 Townsend, Prof., 88, 98.
 Transmission, 34.
 Trench, 108.
 Truth, 6 f.
 Tyndall, 35.

 Unity of mankind, 53 f.
 Ur of Chaldees, 126.


 Vegetable Life, 28, 58.
 Von Humboldt, 110.

 Wallace, Alfred, 32, 91.
 Whately, Dr., 86.
 Whitney, Prof., 110.
 Winchell, Prof., 46.
 World, 31.
 World before the Flood, 89.
 Worship, 171; forms of, 177.
 Writings early, 112.

BS1235 .8.W65

The beginning of things in nature and in

Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library



1 1012 00012 2400